INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL

# EXCHANGE

Fall 1967


*Esther A. Oldt* — U.S. Undergraduates in Latin America

*Kenneth Holland* — The Council on Higher Education in the American Republics

*Kenneth H. Phillips* — Beyond the Classroom

*Harold E. Howland* — Brain Drain From the Philippines

*A. B. Zahlan* — Science and the Emerging Nations

*Joseph Hajda* — The International Officer and the University

Lausanne Conference on the Brain Drain



A PUBLICATION OF THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

*"The Commission . . . shall make reports to the public in the United States and abroad to develop a better understanding of and support for the programs authorized by this Act."*

SECTION 107, PUBLIC LAW 87–256
(THE FULBRIGHT-HAYS ACT)

*Fall 1967*


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **U.S. Undergraduates in Latin America** | *Esther A. Oldt* | 1 |
| **The Council on Higher Education in the American Republics** | *Kenneth Holland* | 9 |
| **Beyond the Classroom** | *Kenneth H. Phillips* | 14 |
| **Brain Drain From the Philippines** | *Harold E. Howland* | 23 |
| **Science and the Emerging Nations** | *A. B. Zahlan* | 29 |
| **The International Officer and the University** | *Joseph Hajda* | 38 |
| **Lausanne Conference on the Brain Drain** | | 44 |
| **New Commission Members Appointed** | | 13 |


DOC EX

# Letters to the Editor

*In the summer 1967 issue of* Exchange *Richard Tyner (Center for International Systems Research, Department of State) commented on three articles in the spring issue. Following are replies from the authors of those articles.*

### Focus on a World Society

While I am not sure that I totally understand all that Mr. Tyner implies by the terms "international" and "bi-national," I believe I can agree wholeheartedly with his conviction that we must exchange our present narrowly national focus for one centered on a world society. Certainly I applaud his statement concerning the need for changes in the content of university courses of instruction and programs to reflect such a shift of emphasis.

By nature something of an optimist, I also believe that what I referred to in my article as "the tidying up of administrative chores" on the part of American universities is an important practical step in precisely that direction. Given more unified and effective direction in many areas of international educational and cultural exchange, American higher education, it seems to me, must inevitably move closer to just that stage of sensitivity toward a world society which Mr. Tyner urges.

James L. Colwell
*Director, Office of International Education*
*University of Colorado*

### Assimilation, Not Alienation

Mr. Tyner rides my metaphor too hard and along a tangent I never intended. He misapplies the word "lost" and, out of what seems to be a deep distrust of American studies as chauvinistic, misunderstands the nature and function of the American Studies Research Centre in India. No doubt I overdramatize the pleasure Indian teachers and scholars feel in discovering a common interest, a professional identity, but the Centre is not an American island in an Indian ocean saving souls lost to their own culture. It is, to begin with, an Indian institute, not American. The Indian scholar is not a scholar come in from the cold. He already has an identity as a human being and as a member of his own society. He may assimilate some broadly Western, even specifically American, skills and attitudes, but assimilation, the way of all synthesis, is not alienation. Mr. Tyner may have met some spiritual drifters who have been "too long in the West" (to echo the title of an Indian novel), but neither the handful of scholars in residence at the Centre at any one time nor the hundreds throughout the country who borrow its books and benefit from its services, are lost any more than their American counterparts in, say, the Association for Asian Studies are lost.

Mr. Tyner says they are lost; I do not. On what grounds does he speculate that scholars in one country who become interested in the culture of another must either have rejected or been rejected by their own society? On his own assumption that they are cultural defectors he questions the value of encouraging them to write about our country instead of their own in a world context: at best, he says, they can only be imitators, second-class American scholars instead of first-class Indian scholars.

I tried out his remark on eight of

the "refugees" in a weekly seminar at the Centre, to their great amusement. These eight come from different parts of India, speaking different mother tongues and professing strong regional loyalties. If anything, they have discovered, along with their professional identity, a stronger sense of nationality in a country still plagued by what the papers call "fissiparous tendencies." American studies, they tell me, far from uprooting them, have led them deeper into their own history, to glimpse possibilities unsuspected before. American studies for the Indian scholar are inevitably comparative, enabling him to see both societies in perspective. Self-knowledge is hard to come by, for nations as for individuals, and often "Only your best friend will tell you." What better dialog than to enable the Indian scholar to write well and profoundly about us, and the American scholar to write well and profoundly about the rest of the world? What greater return for American participation in such a program than the gift to see ourselves as others see us? It would be the beginning of international wisdom. The Romans interpreted the Greeks and achieved the synthesis we call Western civilization. East and West may interpret each other and achieve the new synthesis Mr. Tyner calls for.

But I have a feeling that Mr. Tyner finds my discussion so far irrelevant because I am arguing at the empirical level, the level of inter-nationalism with a hyphen. His disapproval of promoting American studies in India—or in any other country, for that matter—stems from his impatience with "nationalistic" history. He would remind me, I am sure, that the Pax Romana was imperial, as was the Pax Britannica, and he would strive hard to keep the Pax Americana from becoming so. In a letter to me, he says "We have to begin to live and write a new kind of history." Mr. Tyner urgently believes in a World Society (the capitals are his) which, he says elsewhere, is "the new Ideal, the new Utopia towards which man must struggle," and he is dedicated to exploring and defining "the world society theoretical system, its conceptual pattern, and to stimulate similar efforts in other countries."

Mr. Tyner's World Society, so laudable in the abstract, is like the lady in Petrarchan sonnets, all soul and no body. His lofty mystique leads him, like the able man in Emily Dickinson's poem, to "preach upon 'Breadth' till it argues him narrow." Ironically, his internationalism (without the hyphen, since nationalism is to be transcended) produces a limited vision, a failure to realize that One World is not to be studied in the abstract but in its concrete historical components out of which arise the intercultural principles that may save us all. World Society is a concept requiring precepts to give it substance. Mr. Tyner's position is curiously at odds with itself, open at one end to world values, perversely closed at the other to existing programs (in this case, American studies) which may be instrumental in achieving, if not the values themselves (because they are elusive), at least a disciplined search for them.

Mr. Tyner's own search lies in the direction of general principles and theories rather than in the hard particulars of discrete cultures, but even in his hypothetical World-Society Center for the Study of History or his Centers for the Study of Man and His Institutions in every country, his faculty and curriculum, supposedly, would have to grapple with societies and cultures as given as well as with the general principles which explain

how these may contribute to the ultimate synthesis. In his comment on Dr. Colwell's article, he calls for "a change in the content of courses and programs," by which I am afraid he means in the direction of greater and greater abstraction, secular exercises in theorizing about the World Society not unlike the religious exercises of yesteryear which praised God and enjoyed Him forever.

Reinhold Niebuhr reminds us that we steer *by* the North Star, not *for* it, lest we wind up in a polar waste. That, as I see it, is the difference between a world view and a World Society, between an American Studies Research Centre and a Center for the Study of Man. A horse and cart, says an old Chinese proverb, are not two, but three—the horse, the cart, and the two together. The relationship is as important as the realities related—whether horse and cart, man and wife in marriage, or nations sharing the bed of a common humanity. I am with Mr. Tyner in his emphasis on "the two together," but equally insistent that at the same time we do not neglect the horse and cart, those area studies without which there could be no third dimension of world studies, much less of a world society.

WILLIAM MULDER, *Director*
*American Studies Research Centre*
*Hyderabad, India*

### Integration Within Regions

I think we have many instances around us and in history of multicultured or bi-cultured men. Switzerland contains literally hundreds, if not thousands, who have been steeped in one of the other languages besides their mother tongue (and with the attendant culture) since childhood. Many prominent Swiss are thoroughly at home in any part of their country. You find numerous instances of people born in one country who grow up in an entirely different cultural environment during childhood, but who return sufficiently often to their homeland so that they truly do grow up in two cultures; often such children have a father from one culture and a mother from another. It is of course difficult to plan this sort of thing, but it can be simulated to some extent.

I would differ a bit with Mr. Tyner when he says "World Society looms on the horizon as the next stage in the organization of man." I am afraid that a world culture and a world society are far beyond the horizon. If one projects present trends into the future, I think he might see two strongly conflicting tendencies at work for some time to come: centrifugal forces of nationalism, particularly in the newer countries of the third world, and the centrifugal forces of international cooperation and integration, most clearly and successfully developing in Europe. There are rather natural regions in the world where integration can fully take place in the next decades, at least to some degree. Europe and the North Atlantic areas offer the best hope that this can be done; then comes perhaps Latin America, and if we are lucky, some regions of the Pacific and Southeast Asia. Before world culture, society or polity are possible, it is my feeling that we must learn to live as regions and work for cooperation within and among them.

JAMES R. HUNTLEY
*Secretary General, Council of the Atlantic Colleges*
*London, England*

*Why aren't more American undergraduates studying in Latin America? Why are there so few Latin American programs sponsored by U.S. institutions? Miss Oldt has probed these questions in discussions with her colleagues here and in South America.*

# U.S. Undergraduates in Latin America

## *A Report and a Critique*

*by ESTHER A. OLDT*

UNDERGRADUATE study abroad has increased enormously in the past decade—but not in Latin America. Though no one knows the exact numbers of education abroad programs and students enrolled in them—for surveys, inexact at best, are out of date before they can be completed and published—the Institute of International Education (IIE) estimated at least 7,500 American undergraduates abroad on 200 college-sponsored programs in 1966, and in 1967 at least 10,000 students on 300 programs. The number of colleges and universities operating programs doubled, then tripled, in 3 years. But Central and South American enrollments have tended, if anything, to decrease.

Whether the whole undergraduate-abroad movement is good, bad, or of dubious value is not the issue with which I am here concerned.[1] Rather, I want to report something of the nature and extent of programs in Latin America and take a look at some related puzzles and problems. In so doing, I make several assumptions: that, as is frequently pointed out, the United States and Latin America have long

ESTHER A. OLDT, *professor of international education at Antioch College, became the director of Antioch Education Abroad when the program began in 1956. She has degrees from Alma College and the University of Michigan, and has also studied in Austria, England, France, and Italy. For the past 3 years she has been engaged in research and evaluation of undergraduate studies abroad and their impact on the home institution.*

[1] Of course its history, philosophy, and purposes are important. For excellent summaries of growth and development, and analyses of issues and problems, see Dr. Stephen A. Freeman's introduction to *Undergraduate Study Abroad,* revised edition, 1966, and Dr. Ben Euwema's report of three conferences on *Undergraduates Overseas,* 1967, both published by the Institute of International Education, New York.

been ignorant and misinformed about each other; that this is politically dangerous and culturally undesirable; and that education is an important means of change. Two more things are clear: that undergraduate education abroad is very much a part of the picture, and that, as even a hasty perusal of program publicity indicates, belief in such programs as a means to cultural enlightenment is widespread.

"Educational Exchange in the Americas" was the theme for the April 1967 meetings of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. For a workshop in Mexico City arranged by the U.S. Students Abroad Committee—itself a recent development in an association traditionally devoted to foreign students in the United States—I undertook to update information on U.S. students in Latin America. Of 82 colleges and universities on IIE and Pan American Union lists, 25 announced current academic-year programs in Latin America; 21 had summer programs; and 36 did not appear on any recent lists but had indicated in 1962 they planned Latin American programs.

### FEW GO TO LATIN AMERICA

The response to my inquiries was good—almost 80 percent. But figures are still incomplete, as were the original lists and as are totals for all study abroad. Yet the overall trend is clear: Very few of the estimated 10,000 undergraduates or of the 300 programs were in Latin America—in Central and South America, only 121 students on 8 programs in three cities: San José, Bogotá, and Lima. The 8 programs represent 40–50 colleges, members of operating associations. Two more colleges expect to have students in Argentina and Brazil in 1967–68. Even adding estimates for these and for nonreporting programs, however, the total can scarcely top 250 students in less than a dozen programs.

We generally assume that Mexico, closest to us, is flooded with U.S. students. But there is little evidence that this is so. Only 226 were reported on academic-year programs in 1965–66, 201 in 1966–67.[2]

About 2,000 U.S. students—not all undergraduates and certainly not all for credit—go to summer schools in Mexico each year. This may or may not foster real interchange between North and South Americans, however. Summer schools, with a majority of students and sometimes even professors from the States, may hardly afford any acquaintance with Mexicans unless they also provide such opportunities as living in Mexican families.

But enrollment figures do not tell the whole story. In my opinion some of the most stimulating and imaginative ventures in all undergraduate education abroad are to be found among the few in Latin America.

### PROGRAMS IN SCIENCES

Two of these emphasize sciences. (This is in itself unusual, for most programs abroad are oriented toward humanities and social sciences.) The first is for male engi-

[2] Since my inquiries went only to programs administered within the United States, such U.S.-patterned institutions as the University of the Americas in Mexico City appeared only if students enrolled there were reported by their home colleges. Nor did I gather data on graduate programs, Latin American studies on U.S. campuses, or a wide variety of university contracts. The Pan American Union, Department of Educational Affairs, Washington, D.C., is now conducting a comprehensive survey of U.S. university involvements in Latin America; and Education and World Affairs (522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10036) has just released a *Survey of U.S.-Mexican Educational Relations at the University Level.*

neers—again, most programs abroad enroll many more women than men—of the College of Engineering of the University of Wisconsin, of Case Institute of Technology, and, starting 1967–68, of Stanford University. Reciprocal exchanges, not only of undergraduates but of graduate students and faculty, with the host institution, Instituto Tecnologico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, have been important from the beginning in 1961. Mrs. Bonnie Kienitz, coordinator, writes, "the program is the only one we know of where *engineering* undergraduate students can live and study abroad and still not get 'out of phase' with . . . classmates who do not go." Curricula are carefully worked out in advance to include Spanish—a preparatory year on campus and a summer session—as well as some Mexican history and social science, all unusual in engineering sequences.

Farther south, the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) utilize tropical Costa Rica for "field research studies relating biological, social, and economic phenomena" to an environment very different from the home campuses of the 10 member institutions. Juniors and seniors—twice as many men as women—spend 6 months to a year collecting and analyzing data and writing reports under supervision of four resident staff and two or three faculty members of ACM colleges with, however, only "informal cooperation" with Costa Rican university and government agencies. Such a highly individualized program for so few students—10 and 18 the last 2 years—has been "very expensive," and Dr. Blair Stewart, president of ACM, writes that procedures are being revised to achieve something more nearly self-supporting.

One distinctive feature of the Latin American program of the Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA), for which Antioch College is operating agent, is a highly ingenious calendar accommodating 12 different campuses and Latin American cooperating universities, with different stages enabling students of varying language preparation to enter at their own levels. Perhaps most unusual is the number of affiliations with different universities in Mexico and Bogotá, Colombia. These, with additional language and culture courses taught at our own GLCA center, afford a wide range of study, open Latin American classes to U.S. students, and avoid dependency on one university alone, an important factor in the uncertainties of Latin American systems and political climate. But for GLCA, too, though enrollments were somewhat larger than ACM's and Wisconsin's—just over 40 in Colombia each of the past 2 years—problems of maintaining a very expensive individualized program have been acute.

### OLDEST SURVIVING PROGRAMS

The two oldest programs south of Mexico—oldest and still surviving—are Indiana University's in Peru and Kansas University's in Costa Rica. Calendars of operation are those of the Latin American universities, enabling U.S. students to enter regular classes in the host institutions, which in turn forces language competence. Indiana's program capitalizes on its proximity to archaeological sites and other rich sources of Spanish-American art and history. Department of State financial and orientation assistance has doubtless helped to continue programs with relatively small enrollments—20 and 17, respectively, in 1965–66, 15 and 9 in 1966–67.

Almost all programs originate in Southwestern, Western, or Mid-

western States or in associations of church-sponsored colleges, especially Catholic. San Marcos University in Lima is host to the one New England college program in South America — Dartmouth's. Unfortunately, enrollments of five in one year, one last year, will not materially change New England's lack of inclination southward.

Some challenging programs operate in different countries in different years: for example, church-sponsored junior-years-abroad such as that in Argentina of the Council of Mennonite Colleges; the year-long, campus-wide study of a region combined with exchanges and travel at Western College for Women; Lewis and Clark's recent and ingenious programs with students in Costa Rica and Brazil in 1967–68 and in Mexico and Peru in 1966–67; and the community development projects of Cornell's United Religious Work Center, which prepares students during an academic year to go to summer community development projects in the villages of Honduras, Guatemala, or Brazil.[3]

## WHY SO FEW?

As is evident from these few samples, there seems no lack of imaginative programing. Then why are enrollments in many of them so discouragingly small that program after program has closed, in contrast to Western Europe where few are ever discontinued? Among recent Latin American terminations are New York University's Junior Year in Brazil; Fordham's in Chile; and Colgate's in Argentina. What kinds of problems are involved, from the viewpoint of both Latin America and the United States?

One objective of the Mexico City workshop in April was to probe some of these questions. Three eminent speakers commented on various aspects of cooperation among institutions north and south: Dr. Efrén C. del Pozo, secretary-general of the Union de Universidades de America Latina; Mr. John Bowman, executive director of the Council on Student Travel, which with ICETEX (Colombian Institute for Advanced Training Abroad) sponsored the first conference in Latin America directed especially to administrators of U.S. programs abroad; and Dr. Rogélio Diaz-Guerrero, psychiatrist and professor of psychology at the National Autonomous University of Mexico. Contributing to subsequent discussion were resource people who represented the range of U.S. undergraduate programs in Latin America: Dr. William Allaway of the University of California, Dr. Nicholas Gomez Michel of the Association of American Colleges and Universities for Programs Abroad, Licenciado Enrique Romero-Yllades of Antioch's and GLCA's Latin American Programs, and Professor Bernard A. Tonnar, director of the international studies program at Loyola University (New Orleans, La.) and director of the University's Summer School in Mexico. I am much indebted to all these contributors for much of what follows.[4]

## NO LANGUAGE PROBLEM

John Bowman, analyzing failures and successes, pointed out that one

[3] Several others not directly related to academic study attract hundreds of students every summer, high-school age and up: the well-known Experiment in International Living, Lisle Fellowship, National 4-H Clubs, International Christian Youth Exchange, YMCA, Youth for Understanding—in years to come these should mean much more potential interest in Latin America among undergraduates.

[4] Texts of the three major speeches at the Mexico City session, and a summary of the survey, are available from the NAFSA Central Office, 1860 Nineteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

obvious difficulty for many programs abroad — recruiting students with sufficient language ability—does not seem to apply to Spanish in the United States. Spanish, he said, "is already the most widely taught language in our public schools . . . in 1964–65 over 1,800,000 enrolled, compared to 1,586,000 in French. In college, despite increasing interest in French, 3,800 college students were majoring in Spanish in their junior year, compared to 4,800 for French and only 1,400 for German . . . Spanish is the most widely spoken second language in the United States; thus it is easier to recruit teachers with native fluency in Spanish."

If there is no lack of opportunity to study Spanish, is there high cost to the student? Or unattractive environment? Bowman continues, "travel to a Spanish-speaking area costs less . . . from almost any U.S. location . . . than to a French or German-speaking area. . . . The growing popularity of travel for North Americans to the Mexico-Caribbean area testifies to the attractiveness of its scenery, climate, and unfailing hospitality."

Do students return unenthusiastic about Latin America then? All my evidence indicates that the reverse is true. Wisconsin-Monterrey reports that enthusiasm runs high and continues among the engineering graduates. A few are teaching, and many plan graduate studies or industrial affiliations in areas related to Latin America.

### NO LACK OF IMPACT

Dr. Richard Stavig, writing about Kalamazoo College's 1-year experiment in Ecuador, observes that "two of the four students (who completed a year's study in Quito) have gone into Latin American studies . . . another is teaching Spanish . . . the impact on these students seems hardly in doubt."

My own experience with Antioch students dates back to 1958 when our study program in Mexico began. In 1964–65 approximately a third of past participants were interviewed to determine reactions to the family-living aspect of the experience. To simplify a fairly complex analysis: 85 out of 99 interviewed were satisfied, and over half enthusiastic. A comment of one alumna, 5 years after studying in Mexico, is fairly typical: "undoubtedly my most enlightening experience, during my stay at Antioch, and of my life before and after my college years—mainly developing a perspective of the world and of the United States within it; also valuable for language skills and information gained; family experience especially enriching."

Neither language nor lack of impact is a basic problem apparently. Are there then serious problems of operation?

There are indeed operational difficulties: differences in calendars, in teaching and advising systems, in living conditions, in social and political mores, and many other factors too complex to be considered adequately here. But some must be mentioned.

Among the most vexing for undergraduate programs anywhere are questions of academic quality, frequently related to institutional prestige. John Bowman referred to "campus wisdom": that Spanish is easier than French or German, a bit less respectable in terms of academic rigor. There is an accompanying notion that a European university degree carries more prestige than a Latin American degree. And certainly some historic deficiencies of library and housing facilities and economic resources are very real.

Much of this, however, is irrelevant, since U.S. undergraduates are not taking degrees at foreign universities and are generally not

eligible for the graduate-level professional courses which give most universities their reputations.

I have indicated that many Latin American programs seem to me both ingenious and imaginative. They represent, I believe, devoted effort by a few individuals—but too few to deflect the strong tide toward Europe which exists on most campuses. Part of our difficulties, then, lie in our orientation. Most of us are in the European tradition, in one way or another.

U.S. ignorance of Latin American history and anthropology is generally profound. Evidences of some of the most highly developed ancient civilizations of the world lie to the south of us, are seldom studied. After visiting some of Mexico City's archaeological sites and the unbelievably beautiful museum, a British colleague wrote: "I can't think why every Antioch student isn't clamoring to go to such a magnificent country, with such warm-hearted people who had—as their fantastic archaeology shows—a great civilization when we in foggy Britain were running around wild painted with woad and wearing animal skins."

But if it is difficult to catch up on history we have never known, it is even more difficult to keep abreast of the changes occurring today in 20 countries so diverse and so different from us and from each other. We can perhaps begin by avoiding easy generalizations about the Latin American systems of higher education.

### CHANGING HIGHER EDUCATION

Dr. del Pozo emphasized that higher education is changing very rapidly. The innovations include moves toward adopting the U.S. credit system; new scholarships in spite of generally tuition-free study, to remove economic need as a factor in career choices; and wide changes in university calendars to enable students to move more freely in both South and North American countries. Most of all, he said, universities are "leaving behind the . . . loose associations of colleges for the liberal professions and are integrating faculties of philosophy and sciences, research institutes, and . . . full-time professors . . . as a backbone for new fields of study. . . ."

At least 30 new universities were built in Latin America between 1950 and 1960; moreover, *new kinds* of universities combining traditional patterns with selected parts of U.S. systems: unified campuses, all-university courses in contrast to once-dispersed, highly specialized professional schools; full-time staff in contrast to part-time teaching lawyers, doctors, and architects—a long list tends to shatter some stereotypes of the slow-moving, tradition-bound Latin.

### STUDENTS IN POLITICS

Until very recently when the political climate on some of our own campuses began to change, one of the most striking differences between the two Americas was the degree of political involvement of students in Latin America, including participation in both national and university governance, and the existence of the "professional student" who might, among other things, be agitating against the United States. Might our university administrators, parents of students, even our students themselves veer away from dangers of studying in countries daily subject to political upheavals?

I found little evidence that such factors affect our program decisions. Nor do our colleges rush to close programs overseas unless actual war breaks out. No, if anything, we have too little concern and understanding of political as-

pects of Latin American universities.

Dr. del Pozo, tactfully pleading for mutual understanding, pointed out that some generally criticized characteristics arose out of historic reforms and are not likely to change: for example, close relationships between universities and public life and participation of students in university governance are written into laws correcting abuses of the past when education was for only the favored few. True, he said, "the generosity and inexperience of youth may be exploited by demagogues," with resulting harm to academic life, but "we should not forget that the students have also promoted renovation of methods, have fought against acquired interests, and have denounced the influence of tyrants and dictators."

Other Latin Americans suggested that many of our programs have remained too far from the mainstream of Latin American education. Latin American universities and educators, they intimated, should be more involved in programming and planning. Much of this lack of Latin American involvement is probably our own fault.

A striking development of the last few years has been formation of the associations of colleges and universities to which I have already alluded, formed to do together what none could do separately. But associations have their disadvantages. John Bowman pointed out that "drawing students from many campuses makes it difficult to coordinate the kind of enthusiastic promotion that a popular professor can undertake on a single campus." And I would add that by the time a program is designed to become acceptable to 10 or 12 U.S. colleges, it will probably be far from suiting one or more Latin American institutions.

Possibly the most acute problems lie in what Bowman calls "social and intellectual interaction"—not only of students, however, but of program administrators and professors as well. Without taking sides on whether there may be some "fundamental alienation between the two Americas," [5] we can profitably look at some studies with practical implications for any planners of programs calling for cooperation between North and South Americans.

Dr. Diaz-Guerrero, the final speaker on the Mexico City panel, described some research on differences between Mexican and U.S. students. "Our real focus of interest and our approach," he said, "is the attempt to measure something as tenuous as the philosophy of life of different peoples."

I quote here only a small part of his paper:

> At the Tenth Inter-American Congress of Psychology, held in Lima in 1966, we were able to report a number of interesting differences between the psychological patterns of the U.S. and Mexico:
>
> In a questionnaire called The Views of Life that we developed in collaboration with the University of Texas and which attempts to measure what we call sociocultural premises, one item gives these alternatives:
>
> (a) In a business situation an established atmosphere of equality is preferable.
> (b) An established hierarchy of authority is preferable in a business situation.
>
> In this case, 32 of 46 American students selected the hierarchy of authority, while only 40 of 96 Mexicans selected it.
>
> Another point: one of the most important single values for the Mexican—and probably for Latin Americans in general—is the development of good interpersonal relationships. It seems a *sine qua non* for anything else which might take place; it is a prerequisite for Mexicans, we might say. Americans on the other hand consider it an important value to be autonomous, and usually consider competition one of the best ways of getting ahead.

---

[5] See, for example, "The Strange Career of Latin American Studies," by Richard M. Morse in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* November 1964; and some comments by Saxton Bradford in "Program in Search of a Concept," *Exchange,* Summer 1965.

We received interesting answers to the following questions in this respect:

(a) I prefer a work partner who is friendly.
(b) I prefer a work partner who is hard-working.

To this, 30 of the 48 Americans selected the hard-working partner, while 61 of the 96 Mexicans preferred the friendly partner. To the question

(a) Cooperation is better than competition, to achieve results.
(b) Competition is better than cooperation, to achieve results.

20 of the 48 Americans selected the competitive alternative while only 21 of the 96 Mexicans selected it.

IN SUMMARY, we find a number of reasons behind the lack of growth in our Latin American education abroad programs—many of them not precisely what we would expect. For we find many more problems and difficulties arising in the area of psychological attitudes and misunderstandings than in the specific and more common education abroad problems such as language ability or travel costs.

Granting, from all that has been said above, that Latin America is a vastly rich and culturally exciting place to be, we must patiently work out ways to change these widely held attitudes.

### ATTITUDES TOWARD LIFE

I would like to close by quoting once more from Dr. Diaz-Guerrero:

Let me finish with the answers to another question in our questionnaire. This result I have found most delightful because it goes beautifully with some of my basic hypotheses in cross-cultural research, and because it involves a great deal of wisdom. To the alternatives

(a) Life is to be enjoyed.
(b) Life is to be endured.

only six Americans of 48 selected "to be endured," while 67 of 92 Mexicans selected it. Yet if you observe groups of Americans and groups of Mexicans, it would appear that Mexicans are enjoying life while Americans are clearly enduring it. Why is this? Perhaps the American student hopes to be able to press a button to secure happiness, while the Mexican knows that life is tough but then proceeds to enjoy it as best he can. On the other hand, American students feel very frustrated whenever they find that life is not so easy.

THIS, I THINK, is a point well taken for all of us. Something of the "press-button" notion may indeed have affected our Latin American programs abroad. Working out scheduling and organizational systems, changing attitudes and stereotypes, publicizing the overwhelming excitement of study in the Latin American countries—all this is often strenuous activity. But we cannot give up without a fight: there is too much to be lost in our failure. And perhaps if we can for a time endure, then we may gain the pleasure of seeing good, strong programs for U.S. students in Latin America to the greater benefit of all of us.

*CHEAR was established in 1958 to develop a program for furthering meaningful contacts between educators in North and South America. The author describes CHEAR's projects and activities and what it has accomplished in these 9 years.*

# The Council on Higher Education in the American Republics

*by KENNETH HOLLAND*

IT was summertime in February of this year and 30 men and women were congregating in Viña del Mar on the Chilean coast. They were speaking English and Spanish and French and Portuguese, and some casual observer might have thought them tourists. But they were conversing on the responsibility of the university in the problems of urbanization, population growth, agriculture, and nutrition. They were—all of them—presidents and rectors of American universities, both North and South. They were in Chile for the ninth annual meeting of the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics—or CHEAR, as it is called—which is administered by the Institute of International Education.

CHEAR was formed in the spring of 1958 when the Carnegie Corporation of New York asked the IIE to take responsibility for a program to establish meaningful contacts between educators of North and South America. The Ford Foundation joined the Carnegie Corporation as a sponsoring agency in 1960 and since 1966 has been the principal source of administrative funds.

Although it was characterized from the beginning as an informal discussion group, CHEAR has been able to perform many functions in inter-American higher education and many action projects have resulted from its deliberations. It has become the principal agency that provides continuing opportunities for university presidents and rectors from North and Latin America to exchange professional ideas, information, reactions, and requests for cooperation.

CHEAR's objectives are accomplished through a series of small an-

KENNETH HOLLAND *has been president of the Institute of International Education since 1950. Before that he served as the first Permanent U.S. Representative to* UNESCO *in Paris. Earlier as executive secretary of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, he helped set up the Fulbright Scholarship Program. He is currently also Secretary General of the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics.*

nual conferences of selected Latin and North American educators who discuss problems of higher education in the hemisphere; through visits by participating educators to universities in North and Latin America; and through the development and carrying out of seminars and educational projects designed to meet jointly determined educational needs and interests.

Some of the questions explored at these seminars have been: how to improve library sciences and provide much needed textbooks, how to strengthen and expand Latin American area study programs in U.S. institutions and U.S. study programs in Latin American universities, and how to stimulate and aid teaching and research in scientific and technological fields in Latin American universities. The methods of teaching science, sociology, economics, and the history of ideas in Latin American institutions have been discussed, as also the subject of interdisciplinary education.

### LIBRARY SCIENCE

The Seminar on Inter-American Library Science, held in Monticello, Ill., in January 1961 with the American Library Association, led to a survey of types of books and materials being produced by university presses. It was conducted by Professor August Frugé of UCLA and Professor Carlos Boach Garcia of Mexico. Following this, a study of the possibilities for producing instructional materials through commercial channels was made by Franklin Publications. Other publishing firms and foundations are also interested now in producing and distributing books and learning materials to Latin American universities.

### LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

At the Seminar on Latin American Area Studies, conducted with the cooperation of the University of California at Los Angeles in February 1961 and led by Chancellor Franklin Murphy, a selected group of inter-American program directors shared information on the common problems they faced in developing new study programs. After the meeting several universities redefined their existing Latin American area study programs or initiated new ones. Other developments, probably influenced by the CHEAR recommendations, were the extension of the Ford Foundation's Foreign Area Training Fellowship to include Latin American countries and the appropriation of U.S. Government funds to strengthen Latin American area study programs.

### SOCIOLOGY SEMINAR

After the Sociology Seminar held at Stanford University with the American Sociological Association in August 1961 a number of the Latin American participants volunteered to conduct research studies in their own countries. The Social Science Research Council published these papers and distributed them to leading sociologists in North and Latin America. Similarly the Economics Seminar, conducted with the American Economics Association at Santiago, Chile, in August 1962, generated a series of analyses and recommendations of use to universities in strengthening their faculties of economics. The report of this seminar has been prepared in English and Spanish and widely distributed among North and Latin American universities.

### ENGINEERING

Additional accomplishments resulting from CHEAR deliberations include a survey of engineering and technical education in Latin America made by President T. Keith Glennan and Professor Raymond Bolz of Case Institute of Technology with Professor Rex Hopper of

Brooklyn College. In his report to the 1962 CHEAR conference at Rio de Janeiro Dr. Glennan pointed out the great need for skilled, well-trained technicians and junior engineers throughout Latin America. These individuals, understanding modern processing techniques and manufacturing methods, could be the foremen, supervisors, and specialists in quality control and method application. Dr. Glennan estimated that technicians should be trained at the ratio of 10 or 15 to one graduate engineer. His findings motivated an Engineering Educators Seminar of Latin and North Americans which was held in February 1963 at the Case Institute in Cleveland, Ohio.

### LAW SCHOOLS

In another survey conducted by CHEAR, Dr. Milton Katz, director of international legal studies at Harvard University, studied the nature of legal education in selected Latin American universities. This led to a request from Brazil and Chile to meet with Harvard specialists in law, economics, and sociology to consider ways to improve university programs for the training of lawyers. The meeting was held in December 1962 in Brazil with the support of the Ford Foundation, but with a change in rectors little was done specifically to develop cooperative projects among these three universities.

### STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Another CHEAR project was the Comparative Study of Higher Education in the American Republics financed by the Ford Foundation. For 2 years a staff directed by Dr. Harold Benjamin, under the general supervision of Dr. Anisio S. Teixeira of Brazil, worked on a detailed study of higher education in the Americas collecting extensive basic data from both large and small universities in Latin America. Because of a lack of printed reports and documents, investigations had to be conducted through personal visits to universities and by the use of specially selected consultants in the different geographic regions. The study, published in 1965, treats the history, organization, programs, faculty, student population, and major problems of universities in the Americas. It analyzes observable developmental trends and conditions affecting future growth and impact of the universities.

### TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Participants in CHEAR conferences and meetings concur that the exchange of ideas among North and South American educators can produce measurable and useful results. For instance, during the San Francisco conference of 1961, Rector Juan Gomez-Millas of the University of Chile was intrigued by discussion of California's 2-year college plan. He requested that specialists from that State visit Chile to investigate the possibility of establishing such institutions there. The Ford Foundation made this possible, and as a result the first three of a series of eight to ten 2-year colleges have been constructed in Chile emphasizing vocational and technical education. One interesting aspect of the new institutions is that, whereas at the University of Chile only 2 percent of the student body come from low-income families, the 2-year colleges draw 27 to 28 percent from this group.

### SCHOLARLY JOURNALS PROJECT

Another example of direct material assistance given by CHEAR to Latin American educators and students is its scholarly journals project. Few U.S. learned journals in the humanities and social sciences had been available in Latin America in spite of continuing requests

by professors for additional materials in their specializations. After careful consideration CHEAR and the American Council of Learned Societies identified 13 major scholarly journals in the humanities and social sciences and, in June 1962, presented 1-year gift subscriptions to these publications to 775 selected scholars and institutions in Latin America. None of these journals had previously had a circulation in Latin America greater than 71 copies. Letters received from the recipients reveal not only their gratitude but also their intention to make wide use of the journals among colleagues and students.

### CLOSE PROFESSIONAL TIES

Because of CHEAR's small, intimate size, close personal and professional ties between educators of North and Latin America can be developed. By supporting two visits to the United States by Dr. Carlos Tunnermann Bernheim, who studied the organization and function of three regional educational associations, CHEAR was able to help the Consejo Superior Universitario Centroamericano (CSUCA—A Central American education association) get started. It also provided professional assistance and advice to the director and staff of the association and aided in designing projects for submission to foundations and other financing agencies. Dr. Tunnermann, having completed his term with CSUCA, is now rector of the University of Nicaragua and a participant in the annual CHEAR conferences.

### INDIRECT RESULTS

While it has not been part of CHEAR's objectives either to initiate or to sponsor concrete projects of higher education or to promote cooperative educational ventures between institutions, there are, nevertheless, several such developments which may be clearly traced to the personal relationships and intellectual stimulation provided by CHEAR.

Examples of these indirect effects of CHEAR are the modernization of the basic sciences program at the University of São Paulo, the Kansas–Costa Rica faculty and student exchange program, the University of Chile–UCLA regional college program, the Columbia University Institute of Latin American Studies, and the Venezuelan Institute for Scientific Research—University of the Andes (Colombia) exchange program.

### DEMOGRAPHY

A recent example illustrates the direct and immediate impact of CHEAR on Latin American higher education. In February 1966 CHEAR sponsored a Seminar on Teaching and Research in Demography held in Antigua, Guatemala. Its basic objective was to stimulate new university programs designed to come to grips with the problems attending the rising rate of population growth. Among the 40-odd participants were seven Latin American university rectors. One of them was Dr. José Felix Patino of the National University of Colombia in Bogotá, who, upon his return to the university, took steps to create a Center of Demographic Studies. In March 1966 the Consejo Superior approved the establishment of the center, which is located in the Latin American Program of Studies in Development. This program is the postgraduate interdisciplinary division of the Faculty of Social Sciences in the university. In a letter to CHEAR dated March 25, 1966, Dr. Patino noted that the new center would influence developments in the field of population studies not only at the National University but also in other institutions of higher learning in Colombia.

OTHER CHEARS

Because of CHEAR's success similar programs are now being developed in other parts of the world. In Paris this past summer several distinguished American educators met with Frenchmen such as Jean Roche, rector of the University of Paris; Pierre Aigrain, Director-General of Higher Education; Pierre Jacquinot, Director of the National Center of Scientific Research; Guy Debeyre, rector of the University of Lille; Robert Davril, rector of the University of Nice; and Gerald Antoine, rector of the University of Orléans. The basic idea was to discuss the "form of a forum" between French and American educators and to explore the possibility of a CHEAR-type program between the United States and Western Europe.

WE HAVE REASON to believe that our preliminary discussions this summer will, in retrospect, be the first step in a long and continuing dialog. At the same time, we are looking into the possibility of establishing programs with other areas of the world. CHEAR, which has already passed from an experiment to an established mode of communication, may now become the model for an extension of our educational relations throughout the world.

# New Commission Members Appointed

President Johnson has appointed two new members to the U.S. Advisory Commission of International Educational and Cultural Affairs. They are Dr. Abram Sachar, president of Brandeis University, and Dr. Robert A. Scalapino, professor of political science at the University of California at Berkeley. Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., president of the University of Connecticut, was reappointed to another 3-year term on the Commission, and Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, president of the University of Colorado, was named chairman of the Commision.[1]

Dr. Sachar, born in New York City on February 15, 1899, received his B.A. and M.A. degrees at Washington University and his Ph.D. from Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He has been a member of the board of trustees of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences, the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library, the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, and the Aspen Institute of Humanistic Studies. Dr. Sachar succeeds Roy E. Larsen, chairman of the Executive Committee of Time, Inc. Mr. Larsen is chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Arts.

Dr. Scalapino was born in Leavenworth, Kansas, October 19, 1919. He holds a B.A. degree from Santa Barbara College and his M.A. and Ph.D. from Harvard University. Dr. Scalapino has served as consultant to the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the San Francisco World Affairs Council. He succeeds Dr. Walter Johnson, professor of history at the University of Hawaii.

[1] For biographical information on Drs. Babbidge and Smiley and the other previously appointed members, see *Exchange*, Fall 1965, p. 62.

*An international traineeship program for tomorrow's executives, organized and run by students of business and economics who recognize the fact of an interdependent world and its significance to human welfare and peace,* AIESEC *this year is exchanging nearly 5,000 students from the top 300 colleges and universities in over 40 countries for practical training in business.*

# Beyond the Classroom

## *Students Become Businessmen*

*by KENNETH H. PHILLIPS*

"When IBM or GM recruits graduates of your school, will it help to have Koninklijke Luchtvaart Maatschappij on your resume? Well, having worked at KLM in the Netherlands would put you a step ahead of other applicants, unless they had had an AIESEC traineeship with IBM in France, Finland, Germany, Japan, or Turkey . . . or unless some other applicant had spoken to a director or vice president of GM about the AIESEC program. Look into AIESEC—a unique program." Right after he saw that sign outside the economics department at the University of Notre Dame, Robert Sullivan from Tulsa, Okla., did exactly that and joined the local AIESEC Committee on campus. After working for the committee during the winter months trying to convince local and hometown companies to participate in the program, Bob was selected for placement in a reciprocal traineeship in Ireland. This summer he worked with IBM in Dublin helping them with their financial forecasts.

Henry Herrod from Tuscaloosa, Ala., saw another sign in his eating club at Princeton. This one read: "Why not take your next summer job in Paris, or Tokyo, or Buenos Aires, or in any one of 40 countries —working and training in a good job—an AIESEC traineeship?" As a result of Henry's participation in the AIESEC program, his next job was in Lagos with the Nigerian Ports Authority.

Roger Lamm was debating several years ago whether to go on to

---

KENNETH H. PHILLIPS *is the Coordinator of Project Development at the Institute of International Education in New York. From 1964 to 1966 he was president of* AIESEC–US, *and last year he was on the executive committee of* AIESEC *International. He received a Ford Foundation grant in 1966 for work at Geneva on the conference on "Education for International Business." Mr. Phillips has degrees from Princeton and the University of Michigan.*

graduate studies in industrial relations. His traineeship with Nippon Oil in Japan, where he did a detailed study on the personnel management policies of the company, helped him to make this decision; it also provided him with the research base for his master's thesis. Now Roger, who is working for his doctorate, is on a traineeship with a major bank in Yugoslavia. In addition to the business and educational value of the AIESEC traineeship, Roger likes to stress the extraordinary cultural values—being an integral and functional part of the foreign society; living and working with the local people; eating, drinking, and arguing with students from many other countries.

Each fall and winter hundreds of American business and economics students meet with thousands of American businessmen to convince them to offer practical traineeships in their businesses here in the United States for carefully selected foreign students. Similarly, French students are talking to French businessmen, Swiss students meet with the business leaders in Switzerland, and the Argentine students make presentations to the business executives in their country. The result is 5,000 job offers by businessmen throughout the world and another successful year for the AIESEC organization.

## WHAT IS AIESEC?

AIESEC is an independent, nonprofit organization created by students to facilitate and administer an international exchange. The emphasis of its program is on placing individual students in individual companies abroad for a short-term business training and cultural experience. Operating on a reciprocal basis, the program enables students from many countries to gain training in foreign business. AIESEC (pronounced "eye-sec") stands for the "Association Internationale des Etudiants en Sciences Economiques et Commerciales."

Founded in the wartorn Europe of 1948 by student representatives of 12 universities from seven countries, AIESEC was one of the very first attempts to re-establish friendly relations among the European countries on a private basis. Since then it has enabled more than 40,000 students to travel to and train in countries other than their own and it is presently active at more than 300 leading universities and colleges in 41 countries on 6 continents.

Qualifications required of trainees vary slightly in the different countries. U.S. participants are students of economics or business who have, at the minimum, completed their sophomore year of college. A recent study shows, however, that two-thirds of the U.S. trainees had received their A.B. before going abroad on the AIESEC program.

The companies which offered the 5,000 traineeships through the AIESEC program this year represent all fields and all sizes of business. Overseas 19 of the 20 largest industrial firms are participating. In the United States the participants include the two largest banks, seven out of eight of the largest insurance companies, three out of five of the largest merchandising firms, the largest utility, and five of the largest industrial firms. The companies, which range from Abex to Xerox, also range from 2 to 700,000 employees.

The participating companies are responsible for providing a challenging training experience for the student and an adequate maintenance stipend during the work period, which is usually 2–3 months in the summer. Students generally cover their own travel expenses, and the small administrative costs are carried by contributions from various groups, including the stu-

dents themselves. In total, the AIESEC program is generating $2.5–$3.5 million each year in support of international educational and cultural exchange.

### AIESEC–US

AIESEC–US is the United States affiliate of the association. Its finances, derived entirely from private sources, are administered by AIESEC–US, Inc., a New York State nonprofit membership corporation with federal tax exempt status. This corporation has been designated an Exchange Visitor Sponsor by the Secretary of State and can therefore issue DSP–66's used for "J" visas. As a result of the use of the "J" visa and the structure of the organization, the brain drain is a negligible factor, with less than .5 percent of the foreign students staying in the United States.

AIESEC–US became the first non-European full member in the program in 1958. Starting with only eight American companies offering traineeships to foreign business students, the program has now blossomed to include in 1967 more than 530 U.S. companies which offered 691 traineeships and consequently enabled as many Americans to benefit from foreign traineeships. Currently 79 American colleges and universities have local committees which together guide the participation of nearly 2,500 members. The program has grown rapidly over the past 6 years and has maintained an incredible annual growth rate of 30 percent for the past 2 years.

Administering this rapidly expanding program in the United States is the task of the AIESEC–US National Committee. Established in 1960–61, with generous support from the Ford Foundation and the Richardson Foundation, the National Committee has demonstrated extraordinary utilization of manpower and funds. This executive body is composed of a president and a vice president—young men who, upon completion of their education, serve as full-time, paid officers of AIESEC–US for a 1- or 2-year period—and paid secretarial assistance of four persons. This small corps directs several voluntary ex-officio directors and six voluntary student regional directors who, in turn, are responsible for the activities of 79 campus committees. Thus, each "paid" hour generates hundreds of voluntary hours.

With unusual straightforwardness, AIESEC–US requires companies participating in the traineeship exchange to pay administrative fees to the National Committee in addition to providing the foreign trainees with salaries.

The efficient use of funds by AIESEC's administration is indicated by the fact that the 1967 budget of $60,000 met the administrative costs for approximately 1,200 American and foreign trainees, an average of $50 per trainee. Such frugal administrative expenditures are highly unusual in today's world of high-cost exchange programs.

Senators Bayh, Brewster, Fulbright, Javits, R. Kennedy, Mundt, Proxmire, and Williams recently joined together in saluting AIESEC:

> For value received per dollar expended, it would seem that AIESEC is one of our Nation's most efficient and productive efforts to create better mutual understanding among peoples of the world and to train future leaders.

### A UNIQUE PROGRAM

Students like Roger, Bob, and Henry are attracted to the AIESEC program because it is unique. It is entirely student operated throughout the world. It is designed especially to serve to educate and broaden the horizons of business and economics students. It achieves these objectives through the administration of a quality traineeship

exchange, the organization of numerous seminars and conferences, and many other activities. Because it is totally dedicated to a practical outcome in all its activities, it is one of the most productive extracurricular programs in which a student can participate.

Since AIESEC relies entirely on the action and initiative of students throughout the world, the program starts again each year with new leaders, new officers, and new members. Each year these students develop the sophisticated administrative, salesmanship, and planning abilities necessary to operate—and expand—a major international exchange organization.

It operates on three levels—local committee at the participating universities and colleges, national committees for each member country, and the International Secretariat in Geneva.

The local committee, an association of students on a participating campus, is responsible for selecting students to receive foreign traineeship offers, for securing similar traineeship offers from local firms to be received by foreign students, and for arranging orientation and educational programs for these foreign students. When Bob became involved with the local committee at Notre Dame, for example, he concentrated on raising traineeships. Roger Lamm became president of the local committee at Berkeley, and after his experience in Japan he was named an ex-officio member of the national committee to coordinate U.S. relations with the Asian AIESEC countries. In all of these activities, of course, the local committee members receive much-valued guidance from faculty and business advisers. Approximately 300 educators and businessmen serve on the local, regional, and national advisory boards throughout the United States.

AIESEC's major activity, the exchange of traineeship offers and the placement of student trainees, is facilitated annually at an International Congress. For example, some 200 student delegates, representing each national committee, will meet in Istanbul in March of 1968 to operate this multilateral trade. As a result of the complexity of exchanging and matching simultaneously 5,000 students and 5,000 job offers, a special subcommittee composed of six students from six countries, with the assistance of IBM, is investigating the use of a computerized exchange process. A trial run will be held at Istanbul and, if successful, it will be adopted for permanent use.

### BENEFITS OF AIESEC

The benefits resulting from AIESEC services represent a response to needs felt both in the United States and throughout the world.

(1) *International relations—cultural, economic, political.* The business and student communities, acting through AIESEC, have served as a means to foster international communications and understanding, to strengthen cooperation and interdependence, to stimulate the spread of economic development and manpower training. The significance—and potential—of the AIESEC program is evident from its establishment in Europe immediately following World War II, its extension to the less developed areas of the world in the early 1960's, and more recently, its exchange with Yugoslavia, with Czechoslovakia, and prospectively with other nations in Eastern Europe.

(2) *Education.* The program contributes to the development of a corps of executives needed by enterprises. University and business school efforts are supplemented through practical training, foreign language experience, administrative experience, and unusual semi-

nars and conferences. A recent publication of EWA, *The Professional School and World Affairs—Business Administration and Public Administration,* cites AIESEC as "the most popular adjunct to international business curricula" and recommends the program to schools as an effective approach to developing an international involvement.

For the student working in a foreign business, AIESEC provides an opportunity to apply his knowledge to a challenging business experience, to motivate him toward more learning, and to define further his career objectives. It also offers the student a rare and meaningful experience—working, training, and living in a foreign environment. To the students organizing and operating the program in their own countries, AIESEC gives the chance to acquire valuable administrative and marketing skills, to deal with community leaders in business, education, and government, and to plan and participate in seminars, conferences, and other activities for foreign trainees.

Associate Dean Frederick Rabenstein of Northwestern's School of Business recently wrote to the Dean of the Business School of another well-known university. He reported:

> We find that our better students naturally gravitate toward participation in the program. The initial advantage is to bring students into contact with corporate executives....The experience of developing a presentation for men who are decision makers in the real business world is a most desirable exercise. The overriding maturing experience on the part of our students participating in international business through their in-depth exposure to foreign operations cannot be matched by any other international exchange program which has come to our attention. The program has become so important to us that an International Business Seminar has been introduced for credit in our curriculum. Trainees going overseas are urged to take this course before taking an overseas traineeship.

(3) *Business promotion.* AIESEC has promoted an international community conducive to business activity. Increased knowledge of products, markets, techniques, ideas, and individuals resulting from AIESEC participation has influenced both the businessmen of today and the students who will become the world's executives of tomorrow.

AIESEC–US recently published *Training for Management: The AIESEC Experience* to aid businessmen in developing high quality practical training programs. The 48-page book consists of the recommendations of several seminars on management training and some 50 case studies of American corporate training programs.

### HOSPITALITY PROGRAMS

To complement its traineeship program, the AIESEC local committees throughout the world offer programs of educational, social, and cultural activities, and sponsor special seminars and study tours. The basis of the AIESEC hospitality approach is the student-to-student or student-to-family relationship. While the traineeship itself involves the student in the local business life, the hospitality program concentrates on involving him in the student and community life. It consists usually of an advance welcome letter, a meeting on arrival at the airport or train station, housing arrangements with a family or in a student house, an introduction to the employer, and information on the community and local activities. Close and personal contact is maintained by the students on the local committee.

Roger Levy, a trainee from France working with Burroughs in Detroit, resisted becoming involved in the hospitality programs arranged at the University of Michigan because he was too busy learning business. After repeated attempts, local committee officers finally got Roger to come to a football game. Over a period of time and after more local

activities, he came to see the real value of the social and cultural programs provided by AIESEC. In fact, near the end of his traineeship he was helping run the program. Roger is now back in France looking forward to his next visit to the States.

In the United States a number of major seminars were arranged during the summer. Recently in Boston a large group of students and educators gathered for 3 days to learn about the economic aspects of "Housing and Urban Redevelopment." In Washington, D.C., nearly 100 AIESEC trainees attended special sessions at the Seventh Annual Seminar on "America's Great Economic, Political, and Social Challenges." Trainees near Detroit attended an intensive roundtable conference sponsored by Chrysler and the U.A.W. on "The American Automobile Industry." In Seattle trainees met with executives from the Port Authority of Seattle and Boeing Corporation to develop viewpoints on "The Role of International Trade in the Pacific Northwest."

Comparable programs are arranged in all the other participating countries.

## BUSINESS LIKES IT TOO

With over 4,000 companies offering some 5,000 traineeships, it is evident that business supports AIESEC. It benefits from the program through direct and indirect management recruitment, improved public and university relations, and the outstanding performance of the trainees. They can become active in the regular workload, undertake special projects, and offer valuable suggestions based on their observations. In addition, participation in AIESEC can improve company morale by enabling a firm's staff to become directly involved in an international goodwill program and by supplying a tangible international element to the company's operations. An official of McKinsey and Company stressed in a recent report that education is "a reciprocal process: the teacher learns, too. The infusion of bright young talent from overseas is stimulating for the domestic staff. There is opportunity here for student exchange in the widest sense."

Many businessmen feel that they can influence the economic and social development of other countries through the international transfer of business skills inherent in the AIESEC program. An official at the Insurance Company of North America in Philadelphia expressed the feeling of many companies when he wrote:

> We have felt that these young college students have a great multiplying effect among their friends, fellow-students, and their associates in the business community, and that by exposing them to American business ethics, management ethics, and the principles of the free enterprise system, we can accomplish a great deal in creating the understanding that is so vital to the future successful operation of all forms of business in foreign countries.

## INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT

The International AIESEC Secretariat was established in Geneva in 1960. In the past few years it has been playing an increasingly important role in the coordination of national and international activities and in the development of new projects. Like the national committee office in the United States, it is staffed by young students who have taken a year or two off from their studies. The secretariat has consultative status with UNESCO and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and is on the special list of the International Labor Organization.

Several years ago AIESEC felt there was a need for an international publication on the subject of education for international business. *The Quarterly Journal of*

AIESEC *International,* which now has a circulation of 5,000, is providing a vehicle for communication among educators, businessmen, and students from all parts of the world. A recent issue included the following articles: "Emerging World Enterprise—Challenge and Opportunity," by Gilbert Clee, director of McKinsey and Company; "Foreign Investment in Canada," by Roger Dehem, professor of economics at Laval University, Quebec; "International Symbolism for Worldwide Marketing," by Howe Martyn, professor of international business and director of the International Business Program of the School of Business Administration at American University; "Manpower for International Management," by Antonie T. Knoppers, president of Merck, Sharp, and Dohme International; "Economic Basis for Integration in Latin America," by Rolando Castaneda, instructor in the department of economics, College of Social Sciences, University of Puerto Rico; and "Caribbean Development and Other Developing Regions," by Antonio Luis Ferre, president of the Council for Higher Education in Puerto Rico and president of the Puerto Rican Cement Company. The *Journal* is published by the International Secretariat (28 Avenue Pictet-de-Rochemont, Geneva) and is interested in receiving articles for publication in the fields of international business, economics, and education.

### TRANSFER OF MANAGEMENT SKILLS

At the recent International Congress in Quebec, the association decided to undertake a 2-year major project on the "International Transfer of Management Skills." The congress was recognizing both the urgency and the importance of the subject itself and the need for AIESEC to take on a greater role in the developing countries. Within this project AIESEC will organize a series of regional seminars during the period of summer 1968 to spring 1969 and a full-scale international conference in 1969. The regional seminars will be organized mainly in the developing nations which are also "developing members" of AIESEC—in Latin America, West Africa, and the Far East. It is anticipated that these seminars will have a by-product in boosting AIESEC in these regions.

In general, AIESEC's intention is to contribute toward highlighting the problems of management development and business education in the developing countries, to examine the appropriateness of transferring proven management techniques from developed nations to regions of vastly different sociocultural backgrounds, and to discuss *practical* ways of transferring such techniques.

The International Secretariat was given the responsibility of consulting with all possible interested individuals and institutions in drawing up a detailed program for this project.

### TRAINING IN SUMMER SCHOOL

In recent years AIESEC has been discussing ways and means to make its traineeship exchange program a more meaningful experience for both the participating companies and students.

To discuss AIESEC's contribution to education was one of the major objectives of its July 1966 "Education for International Business" conference held in Lausanne, Switzerland, for 200 outstanding educators, businessmen, and students. It was felt by conference participants that many useful adaptations could be made of AIESEC's present program in order that the training abroad could be a more significant contribution to the students' business education.

The first adaptation to be implemented is the Summer School Traineeship Program. The idea of such summer schools is that 5–10 students of various nationalities will undertake a coordinated training program in one city during their summer vacation. They will each work in different companies following the same program which has previously been worked out by a local professor or manager in consultation with the participating companies. The student trainees will study a particular industry, or management function, or joint research project. They will meet at least weekly throughout the training period for lectures and group discussions, and at the end of the program will produce joint and individual reports. Each student will bring to the program a particular cultural attitude and knowledge of his own country; all the students will get the opportunity to learn what it is like to work on a multinational business project in a country other than their own.

Five experimental summer school traineeship projects are taking place this summer—in Düsseldorf on "Securities"; in Bergen on "Accounting Principles, Systems, and Organization"; in Prague on "The Organization and Management of the Industrial Enterprise"; in Istanbul on "The Marketing of Oil in Turkey"; and in Brussels on "The Role of Banks in International Economic Relations."

AIESEC is currently developing plans for other new ventures. These include a year-long traineeship program consisting of three separate, consecutive traineeships in separate countries; advanced research traineeships; an international referral service of AIESEC alumni; an information service for educators on international opportunities in teaching, lecturing, conferences, and research activity; and international student research polls.

FOREIGN STUDENT PROJECT

All indications point toward a continued period of growth for the AIESEC committee in the United States. It is estimated that the committee will have available 1,200 to 1,600 traineeships annually by 1970.

On the basis of these developments and expectations the AIESEC–US National Committee has developed a pilot program this past year to permit and encourage foreign students currently studying at U.S. colleges and universities to apply through their local AIESEC–US Committee for participation in the program. These foreign students would be expected to contribute to the development of the program, as are all applicants. They would be permitted to apply for traineeships in any country with a program, with a special emphasis on Canada and Mexico and the United States itself. In other words, a student from India or from Nigeria studying at one of the 79 American colleges or universities with AIESEC chapters could participate in the AIESEC Committee's regular activities and could apply for a summer practical training position through the AIESEC program. If successful in its first year, this pilot program will be expanded and well publicized in the near future. It is aimed at contributing to the solution of the practical training problem facing foreign students in the United States.

AIESEC, with its various programs and activities, represents the essence of international cooperation. A company in one country participates in the program in a sense because another company in another country is also participating. Similarly, universities in one country are willing to give significant support to the program largely because of the corresponding support offered by their counterparts abroad. A student in one country works because he knows another student in

another country is working. This spirit of international cooperation permeates every activity and every program of the association.

"Finally," says Dean D. J. Hart of the University of Florida, "the AIESEC program can contribute substantially to the peaceful development of people and resources throughout the world. When a business firm accepts a trainee from another nation, both nations benefit. When this is multiplied by several thousand AIESEC exchanges each year, involving more than 40 nations and many hundreds of companies, the total impact assumes significant magnitude."

## IIE Census

### Foreign Students in the U.S.

This year's IIE census reports 100,262 foreign students enrolled in the United States institutions of higher learning in the academic year 1966–67. This impressive total—17,500 more than last year and the highest figure ever—reflects the inclusion for the first time of students who expressed the intention of remaining in the United States. There were 13,000 such nonreturning students, 13 percent of the total, compared to almost 11,000, or 11 percent of the total, last year.

### Foreign Faculty and Scholars

This year American universities and colleges were hosts to more than 10,700 foreign professors, scholars, researchers, faculty members, and other senior academic personnel. This is the largest number IIE has recorded; it has risen from 635 in 1954–55.

### U.S. Students Abroad

IIE found 24,900 United States students enrolled in regular academic-year programs in foreign institutions of higher learning in 1965–66, the highest total the IIE census has ever recorded. (Figures from 1965–66 rather than 1966–67 are used because of the difficulties of gathering current data from all over the world.) More than half of them studied in France, Mexico, and Canada, and slightly more than half were studying the humanities.

### U.S. Faculty Abroad

The number of U.S. faculty members involved in educational exchange in 1966–67 increased by about 700 over last year (a year which saw an increase of less than 200 over the year before). The 4,674 total is the highest IIE has recorded.

—From *Open Doors 1967*.

*"What appears in the short run to be a brain drain from a country—and therefore its loss—may be, in truth, one of that country's unique contributions to the world's cultural common market. The brain* drain *from one country today may well be the brain* gain *of the world of tomorrow."*

# Brain Drain From the Philippines

*by HAROLD E. HOWLAND*

A RESPECTED British scientist, Lord Bowden, speaking recently in a debate in the House of Lords, stated that 155 British scientists and 507 engineers had migrated to the United States during the past year. Lord Bowden had calculated that it costs at least $56,000 to train a British scientist to the Ph.D. level. Using that figure, and adding his estimate of a scientist's worth to his nation during the course of his lifetime, Lord Bowden estimated that the loss to Britain from this 1-year migration of 662 scientists and engineers exceeded $460 million. He went on to tell Parliament that that sum equaled Britain's interest payments on its borrowings from the World Bank and on the total foreign exchange which Britain possessed and that it was the largest single item in Britain's balance of payments. He then went on to say that England was recouping its losses to the United States by luring scientists from the underdeveloped countries of the world where they were sorely needed to help those countries advance into the modern age. "It is beginning to be a fact that fields in India will remain uncultivated in order that America may put a man on the moon," he concluded.

At this point, Baroness Emmet of Amberley rose and responded to Lord Bowden's report: "The Pilgrim Fathers emigrated for adventure and greater opportunity and because of dissatisfaction with the government. These reasons are, I am afraid, the same at the present time." Baroness Emmet, I believe, successfully capsulized the subject of the brain drain.

In recent months there has been a plethora of articles, speeches, investigations, and meetings in our country deploring the brain drain. Many people have been highly critical of the United States, indicting us for providing research opportunities, adequate pay, and commen-

---

HAROLD E. HOWLAND *has recently been appointed U.S. Consul General at Amsterdam. Before attending the senior seminar in foreign policy this past year at the Foreign Service Institute, Mr. Howland was Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs and Special Assistant for East-West Center Affairs in the Department of State.*

surate rewards for talents and skills. We are told that about 5,000 foreign scientists are coming to the United States each year; that by the end of this year we will have gained since 1949 an "army" of 100,000 scientists from abroad; that America has saved at least $4 billion because it did not have to educate and train that "army." One reporter has said that 45 percent of Canada's science graduates are taking jobs in the United States. (Canada for its part is recovering its losses by attracting scientists from other developed and underdeveloped countries.)

Senator Edward Kennedy has recently conducted congressional hearings on the brain drain. Newspapers, magazines, scientific journals, and foreign affairs periodicals have devoted article after article to the subject. Government, semiofficial, and private organizations and the academic community have held conferences and proposed resolutions deploring the migration of talents and skills to our country.

It is doubtful, indeed, that any other country in the world would indulge in so much self-criticism over a *gain* in talent and skills as has our country—all of which, of course, reflects our interest in the economic and social progress of other lands.

Senator Rodolfo Ganzon, a member of the Philippine Senate and chairman of its Health and Labor Committee, visited the United States last December. Upon his return to the Philippines early in January he called a conference of labor, health, school, and business officials to whom he reported: "While I was in New Jersey some 300 Filipino doctors and nurses shocked me out of my wits with a lavish reception and dinner. Never did I expect to find so many Filipino doctors in one place." The Senator went on to say, "Personally I think we should limit the migrations of such professionals because many places and people in the Philippines need their services. I aim to stop the 'brain drain' in the form of legislation."

*This article is based on a study written for the senior seminar in foreign policy at the Foreign Service Institute in April 1967. For a previous article by Mr. Howland—on "The East-West Center"—see* Exchange, *Fall 1965.*

Manila's attention was thus focused on the brain drain. The subject has completely captivated the populace of that city. It is of topical interest at professional clubs, at social functions, and at business meetings. No fewer than 60 reports and articles on the subject appeared in the Manila press during the 2 or 3 weeks following Senator Ganzon's report.

Most articles bemoaned any efforts to enact legislation to limit the free movement of Filipino citizens. They urged, instead, that facilities in Philippine hospitals and medical institutions be bettered and that salaries and working conditions be improved, so that Philippine doctors and nurses would be encouraged to remain in the Philippines. Recurring throughout all the columns of press coverage was the theme that the problem lay not in America but "here at home in the Philippines." There was also a prevailing feeling of pride—justified pride—in the evidence that the Philippines had brains and talent to export; that no longer does she send abroad only her unskilled laborers, but now she finds that great nations have need for her talents and skills.

One Government official, when asked her views on the loss of Philippine doctors and nurses replied: "We should accept a global view. America is our ally; we must do our part to keep her healthy."

A Philippine medical doctor, Dr. Vicente R. Limcaoco, in a featured Manila *Sunday Times Magazine* article outlined the frustrations of the young Filipino doctor: his difficulties in establishing a practice in Manila where there is now such a surplus of doctors that many of them turn to other vocations, his inability to get a paying position in a Philippine hospital, the lack of opportunity for graduate training, and the poor working conditions and low pay. Dr. Limcaoco concluded:

> For the brain to stay, an intensely positive approach is necessary. Give the doctor more inducements to work. Improve our hospitals. Multiply them. Give the doctors better jobs. Give them better pay. Make community practice more rewarding. Make the doctors' career better fulfilled.
>
> In the meanwhile, I bid my readers adieu. In a few months' time I'll be joining the exodus. I am extremely flattered that you consider my departure a brain drain.

Many Filipinos, lamenting the loss of professional skills, are bitter in their condemnation of social, economic, and political institutions in the Philippines, implying that the brain drain is symptomatic of greater ills that face their nation today.

### FILIPINOS IN U.S. HOSPITALS

Whatever the reasons for the influx of Filipino doctors and nurses to the United States, the fact is they are here, and in great numbers. About 4,000 Filipino doctors and at least 6,000 nurses are in training or serving on staffs of U.S. hospitals. One-fourth of the foreign medical interns and hospital residents in the United States are Filipinos. The 3,000 Filipino graduate medical trainees constitute about one-sixth of the foreigners getting their graduate training here. There are additional thousands—no one knows exactly how many—of Filipino nurses in Canada, most of whom seek entry or re-entry into the United States.

There would, of course, be no brain drain from the Philippines if the United States had enough medical and nurses' schools to train the doctors and nurses needed to staff its hospitals. Filipino doctors and nurses come here because there is an acute need for them.

Senator Walter F. Mondale and others have deplored our shortages in the medical field. The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service recently reported a shortage of at least 50,000 doctors in the United States. Of 14,000 openings for interns in American hospitals this year, only 7,700 were recruited from American medical school graduates.

While we recognize that American hospitals are eager to get foreign doctors and nurses to fill jobs for which Americans cannot be found, we must also remember that the U.S. Government policy on educational exchange has been to see that students and scholars return home to help their own countries after finishing their period of study.

Many years ago the State Department, anticipating that underdeveloped countries might lose their scholars and scientists to the United States, obtained enactment of legislation for an educational "exchange visitor's visa." This visa has been required of all foreign students, scholars, and researchers who visit our country on Government-sponsored or State Department-approved privately sponsored programs. The regulations require that all those who enter with this visa must leave the country at the end of their period of study or research—with certain exceptions granted in cases of extreme hardship or where the national interest has been involved. That this bit of planning and foresight by the Department of State has been effective in limiting the brain drain is attested to by the fact that

99 out of every 100 students and scholars on official U.S. Government programs have left the United States, the vast majority of them to return to their homelands. Strengthening of this legislation in 1961 further enhanced the effectiveness of the exchange visitor visa. Thus, it may be said that Government officials, responsible for U.S. Government and approved privately sponsored exchange programs, have done their part to see that foreign students and scholars go home, trained and with new skills to apply to their own problems. It now remains for the other nations to create political, economic, and social conditions that will inspire those trained and skilled persons to remain in their homelands.

Approximately 5,000 Filipino doctors take the examination of the Educational Council for Medical Graduates each year hoping to gain admission to an American hospital as an intern or resident. Up to last year, there were about 1,000 Filipino doctors coming to the United States annually on the State Department's exchange visitor visa (the "J" visa). More recently increasing numbers are entering under the authority of the new Immigration and Nationality Act and its "third preference" provision for persons with talents and skills. In 1966 the U.S. Embassy in Manila issued 2,772 "J" visas. From December 1965, when the new Immigration and Nationality Act became law, through February 1967, the Embassy issued 766 "third preference" immigration visas. Based upon applications on hand at the time of this study, it was estimated that more than 200 "third preference" visas would be issued during the month of April 1967. At least 80 percent, perhaps 90 percent, of these "J" visas and third preference visas are issued to doctors and nurses.

## A SURPLUS IN THE PHILIPPINES

This paper has dealt with the exodus of doctors and nurses from the Philippines since the medical profession is the only profession in that country exporting significant numbers of its members to the United States. No evidence is available to substantiate any claims that there are unusual numbers of talented persons migrating abroad from the other sciences or professions. That the migration is of consequence to the medical profession is easily understood—70 percent of all registered scientific and professional people in the Philippines are in the medical profession. Top authorities in the Philippine Government declare that their physicists, chemists, and engineers are not yet trained so highly or in sufficient numbers to attract overseas recruiters.

But one asks: "Do the Philippines actually have a surplus of doctors and nurses and can they afford to export this valuable human resource?" This question was put to Dr. Pacifico Marcos, younger brother of the President of the Philippines and president of the Philippine Medical Association. Dr. Marcos replied: "We have 28,000 registered medical doctors in the Philippines; only 14,000 are in active practice. So where's the brain drain? I prefer to call it the *so-called* 'brain drain.'" Dr. Marcos added: "By myself, I would encourage Filipino doctors to go to the United States for training. I wouldn't even be worried about the exodus of our doctors and nurses, since so many of those graduating from Philippine medical schools each year are unable to get proper placements. We have an oversupply of doctors and nurses, although this is relative because of the number of doctorless areas in the country. Most Filipino doctors go to the States mainly for training, but when they come back to the Philippines they get discouraged either because of lack of facilities

or financial difficulties. Everybody takes them for granted, and so they return to the United States." Yet, Dr. Marcos and other leaders assert that there is a need for more doctors in the rural areas of the Philippines, where there is 1 physician to 5,000 people. In Manila, on the other hand, there is 1 physician for every 671 residents.

But what motivates so many young Filipino men and women to enter the medical profession? When this question was put to a number of Filipino leaders—administrators, public health officials, teachers, and others—they all answered in the same vein. Every parent wants his first son to be a lawyer or a doctor, the first daughter to be a doctor or a nurse—half of the Filipino doctors are women. The medical profession is most prestigious, and parents make great sacrifices to put their children through medical or nursing school. There is also uncommon compassion in Philippine families—girls are taught at a very early age to nurse and care for their little brothers and sisters, and Philippine girls make sterling nurses, as hospitals throughout America will attest.

Doctors are graduated in large numbers for several reasons, chief of these being that, up to 1963, only 2 years of premedical training were required for admission to medical school, and lecture-demonstration in huge classes is the method of instruction in all medical schools. Seven medical schools graduate 1,200 medical doctors a year, only 800 of whom go into active practice. One-third of them go to the United States.

I have concluded that the Philippines do, indeed, have a surplus of doctors and nurses. It may be that, if every medical facility that is needed in all the islands and rural areas were built and adequately staffed, the Philippines would continue to turn out a surplus of medical personnel. When I expressed this thought to Father Frank Lynch, S.J., director of the department of anthropology, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila, his response was in essence: "I have that view. Many countries turn out certain surpluses of human resources for export: Ireland exports priests, Belgium exports nuns." Many of us can think of similar examples for other countries. Certainly we in America have found that we can afford to export businessmen, jazz bands, and performing artists. The Philippines offer the world doctors and nurses. And American hospitals are reaping the benefits.

### CORRECTIVE MEASURES

There is recognition in the Philippines that facilities for graduate medical training must be developed if the country is to retain more of its young doctors. Only 15 percent of the medical graduates of the Philippines can be accommodated today in their graduate schools.

Vocational counseling in the schools is making a small beginning. Students and parents must be convinced that there are rewards and employment opportunities in fields other than the overpopulated medical field.

Three of the Philippine medical schools now require internships in rural areas of the country before they grant degrees. It is hoped that an increasing number of the young interns, having experienced practice in the rural areas, may develop a sense of dedication to work there and stay on after graduation.

The Philippine Medical Association has been granting small subsidies to young doctors willing to serve in the barrios. The association hopes to turn this program over to the Government, with a recommendation that the subsidy be substantially increased. Its hope is that, with a government subsidy and a

house and clinic provided by the rural community, more and more doctors will gravitate to the countryside. Efforts are being made to establish a trust fund made up of contributions principally from Philippine doctors employed in the United States. This trust fund would also be used to raise the subsidy for those doctors willing to practice in the barrios and to purchase equipment for the clinics and small hospitals in the rural areas.

Finally, many Filipinos hope that the great wave of press attention recently focused on the brain drain will persuade the Philippine Congress to grant a larger share of the national budget to medical research, salaries, and hospital facilities so that life in the Philippines may be a little more attractive for the Filipino doctor and nurse.

### BRAIN DRAIN OR GAIN?

Many of those whom we consider today as part of the brain drain will return home one day—perhaps at key points in their countries' history—to help their nations go forward. Many of the young scientists, doctors, and engineers from other countries who are now studying and working in the United States are in fact entries in those countries' bank accounts for future development. The Filipinos boast of Dr. Leopoldo Torallballa who, after many years of absence, returned to the Philippines to inspire and help develop the Philippine Science High School, an institution of great potential. One can hardly poke his head into any Philippine educational, cultural, or economic institution and not find many who "returned home." We need time and we need patience; we must not unthinkingly draw conclusions concerning the brain drain.

We Americans should not forget that Robert Frost, our beloved American poet, left the United States in his youth because his poetry was unrecognized, unappreciated, and unpublished. His poetry was first published in England. For Robert Frost Great Britain provided the opportunity, just as America today provides the opportunity for many of Great Britain's young scientists. But Robert Frost returned home to bless America—and the world—for the next 50 years with his poetry. A young British scientist, a young Filipino doctor—even as the young Robert Frost—feels he must make his mark in this world while he can and where opportunity best presents itself.

We should be aware, too, that hundreds of young Americans are today performing on European stages, in plays and opera and ballet. But our young Americans will return home one day to grace our stages and become our teachers and our leaders in the performing arts.

Let us not condemn ourselves and our institutions for providing for foreign scientists, doctors, and students an atmosphere of free inquiry for study and research which may, one day, well enrich not only America but the world. All humanity benefits when an Italian, an Englishman, or an Indian researcher unravels one of nature's mysteries in an American laboratory.

What appears in the short run to be a brain drain from a country—and therefore its loss—may be, in truth, one of that country's unique contributions to the world's cultural common market. The brain *drain* from one country today may well be the brain *gain* of the world of tomorrow.

*The gap between the developing and the advanced countries is large and growing. Dr. Zahlan discusses certain steps which he believes must be taken in the field of education, and the role that science must play in this process, if the gap is ever to be closed.*

# Science and the Emerging Nations

*by A. B. ZAHLAN*

ONE has the impression that 19th- and early 20th-century Arab observers saw European civilization deriving its strength, power, and quality from political principles rather than from the rapidly developing scientific activity.[1] There was little awareness even of major scientific discoveries. This is still true today. The current objectives of national development are in the military and political spheres. The Republic of Lebanon now spends less than 1.3 percent of its national budget on higher education and less than 0.01 percent on science.

Egypt is the only country in the Arab world where there is an established government commitment to science, but science is not sufficiently high on the priority list. At the moment Egyptian science programs are crippled by the very low pay scale, isolation of the scientists from the outside world, limited expansion funds, high student-teacher ratios, very scanty library facilities, and faculty in-breeding. And yet there are a few competent scientists in Egypt who have managed to develop research programs and establish for themselves an international reputation.

The gap between less developed and advanced countries is large, and it is expanding at an annual rate of about 4 percent of the GNP of the advanced countries. We are right now on the eve of a second technological revolution of even greater magnitude than the previous one. Can the underdeveloped countries practice a policy that will lead to closing the gap?

---

A. B. ZAHLAN *is a B.A. and M.A. graduate of the American University of Beirut and has his Ph.D. from Syracuse University. He has been on the faculty of the American University of Beirut in the physics department since 1956. He has been interested in the problems of "institution building" and cultural transfer for more than a decade. Claire Nader and Dr. Zahlan are organizing a Conference on Science and Technology to be held at the American University of Beirut in November 1967.*

[1] Albert Hourani, *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age 1798–1939* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 38–41.

In general, the answer is no. Most underdeveloped countries are doomed to perpetual backwardness compared to the advanced countries. Total dislocation may be the fate of these communities as a result of the piecemeal introduction of discoveries of the advanced countries in such fields as politics, medicine, agriculture, and education. Decreasing the death rate leads to overpopulation; developing irrigation canals spreads bilharzia; improving the army leads to coups d'etat by young officers; and opening low quality colleges generates incompetent bureaucrats. Perpetual political instability, cultural disintegration, levantism, "evaporation" of intellectual capital are the assured fate of most of these communities.[2] The reason: It is impossible for their primitive institutions to educate in the widest sense of the word the men needed to solve these very difficult problems.

It is possible, however, to conceive of a process which can overcome these vicious cycles and actually develop a healthy "advanced" community. The central element in this process is the university—a center of genuine scholarship and learning. The capability of a community to create, support, and integrate such an institution is the test of whether the gap can be closed or not.

Where does science play a role? The gap is created and expanded by scientific activity. Most (say 70 percent) of the technological and scientific content of the world of 1980 will be discovered and developed between now and 1980—just as 90 percent of the drugs on the pharmacist's shelf today are less than 10 years old. Hence the only mechanism available to a country wishing to advance its development is through intensive activities in those areas of science that will shape the world of tomorrow.

Since the advent of the first industrial revolution in 1770, a number of backward countries have raised themselves to the status of advanced nations. The United States, Russia, and Japan are notable examples. Today, the majority of the world's nations are underdeveloped and are eager to alter their status. Does history teach us a lesson concerning the techniques to follow in these circumstances? In all the successful cases one finds that the university and the technical institutes as *centers for research and scholarship* have played the leading role in the development of the community. Harbison and Myers point out that technical institutes were established in Germany *before* industrialization began.[3] Though a good deal more study needs to be done on the relationship between the rise of scientific research institutes and universities and the development of nations, the present available data support our contention.

When a community embarks on a development program it has to create new research centers operating on the most advanced level. But such a community suffers from an acute shortage of precisely those highly educated and experienced scientists and technicians needed to man such centers. Countries find themselves in a predicament: how to create the requisite institutions when constrained by an acute shortage of the essential brainpower; how best to make use of the available and potential brainpower; how to "drain" suitable brainpower from developed countries; and how to relate this activity in a dynamic fashion to similar activities in advanced countries.

[2] See, for example, Manfred Halpern, "The Rate and Costs of Political Development," in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March 1965, p. 20.

[3] Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers, *Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 137 ff.

The development process consists of one complex activity: intense cultural contact and exchange with more advanced communities. The establishment of universities is an integral part of that cultural contact and exchange.

Cultural exchange between an advanced and a backward country cannot occur in a vacuum; in order that it be an effective transfer, the individuals involved must themselves participate on a creative level in scientific research. Scientific information and the number of scientists are more than doubling once every decade, hence no petty copying program can possibly ever place a backward community on a par with a more advanced nation. University science faculties become obsolescent within one decade unless they participate in the scientific activity that is transforming the profession.

### STUDY ABROAD

One of the main mechanisms for initiating development of a backward community is through the transfer of knowledge from more advanced nations through foreign technicians and the education of its younger citizens in foreign institutions. This has been an accepted mechanism for more than a century. In the United States there was a small but excellent native tradition, but the rapid transformation of U.S. higher education during the 19th century resulted from nearly 10,000 students who did their studies in the avant-garde European universities.

This process is currently occurring on a significant scale: about 25,000 Arab students from Middle Eastern countries are studying abroad.

Tables prepared by UNESCO (*Study Abroad*, 1959–60) indicate that a large majority of foreign students are in technical fields: statistics show that 74 percent of these students are specializing in the natural and social sciences, engineering, medicine, and agriculture; while education and the humanities (with much that is technical in their curricula) account for 24.7 percent. UNESCO also reports that 74 percent of the fellowship programs for study abroad are for work at the university and postgraduate level.

### THE BRAIN DRAIN

Study abroad gives the young citizens of developing countries the opportunity to emigrate and forsake their communities. How many return and how do those who return fare?

The first question is simple to answer. Only about 10 percent of the (Arab) Middle Eastern students in the United States become permanent U.S. residents.[4] I estimate that of those who go to Europe, a similar fraction stays behind. This is not numerically a tremendous drain. The 10 percent who remain can be and often are of great assistance in helping other students from their home country come to the United States. Nearly 90 percent of the scholars and scientists fall into this 10 percent.

At the present time those who have genuine talent for research and scholarship have slim chances of accomplishing much of worth in the conditions prevailing in the national universities in their home countries. Those who attain distinction in a developed nation may in the long run have more influence among the young of their home countries than those who return to plod along in the context of the national universities.

Until recently the foreign student

[4] *The Foreign Student: Exchangee or Immigrant* (New York: Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, 1958, table 2, p. 5.

from the Middle East would usually return home after having obtained his Ph.D. degree. During the past few years this trend has changed, as it should, and increasing numbers of foreign students now spend 2 or 3 years on postdoctoral study. It may be true that the longer the foreign student stays in a foreign country, the greater are the chances of his staying there for good, but the benefits are still worth the risk—at least so long as there are no institutes at home where this experience can be gained.

The fact that students from backward and developing countries have chosen not to return home has been confused with the independent event that highly skilled manpower —doctors, scientists, engineers, nurses—have been immigrating to the United States. The emigration from the Middle East, however, is insignificant. In the 6 years from 1956 to 1962 a total of 53 chemists, 9 physicists, and 5 mathematicians immigrated to the United States *from all of Asia.*

For this same period of time (1956–62) there were *more* than 14 U.S. and European physicists and mathematicians serving in colleges in Beirut, Lebanon, alone. Several thousand American and European technicians and technocrats were manning the oil companies in the Persian Gulf area.

When one ponders carefully this *interchange* of human talent, it becomes clear that the very existence and evolution of higher education in these developing countries is intimately related to foreign study, individual freedom in the selection of fields of specialization, and the selection of faculty members who are specialized in rather narrow fields but capable of flowering under particularly difficult conditions. I view the situation as a necessary transaction between two communities.

From practically every point of view—national, human, and professional—the present situation of freedom of choice and movement is superior to any alternative mechanism. The restriction of foreign students to specialize in areas of "national importance" rather than "personal interest" would reduce their higher education to a shameful lie—unfortunately AID and governmental programs are not free from such pressures. Forceful deportation would waste, in certain cases, brilliant resources.

*The only sane solution is the development of the universities and research programs in the developing countries. This is the factor that will influence the return of the young scholar and scientist.*

Judging by the interest of European and U.S. physicists in short-term appointments at the American University of Beirut and elsewhere in the Arab Middle East, *it is possible to attract almost 10 percent of the annual production of physicists in Europe and the U.S. to the Arab Middle East, given reasonable working conditions.* The majority of those interested in such employment are young scientists with 1–3 years of postdoctoral experience. The fact that this reservoir of willing manpower has not been tapped to the utmost is primarily the fault of the Middle Eastern university.

Ninety percent of those who study abroad return to their own communities. How do they fare?

Those who specialize in the applied sciences (medicine, engineering, agriculture, public health) can in general find situations to which they can adapt.

For those who specialize in the social sciences, economics, and business administration there seem to be no important obstacles in their way to rapid adaptation to a fruitful career. These categories account for the majority of the students returning home. These graduates

promote copying and adapting; by themselves they cannot transform the backward society into an advanced one.

The ones who have the most trouble in finding situations to their liking or fitted to exploit their capabilities are those seeking an academic career with a large measure of scholarly work. This group is small in number but important because it is the only source of steady slow improvement of the universities in developing countries.

## INSTITUTION BUILDING

Since development is desirable and since science and technology play an essential role in this development, we should seek to construct a system of institutions and a pattern of activity that would promote the sciences in backward countries. The cost of these activities may be 10–100 times what is presently spent on higher education in several of the countries under consideration, but this is well within the means of practically all the Arab countries.

The reason why so many institutions of higher education in developing countries have not done as well as might have been expected is that too little attention is given to what may be called the system character of such institutions. To set up an adequate university quality program requires the setting up, nearly simultaneously, of a complex structure consisting of (1) faculty, (2) relationships with colleges and high schools, (3) buildings, (4) laboratory and library facilities, (5) standards for faculty performance, (6) standards for student performance, (7) administrators and technicians, (8) stable financial resources. The development of a program requires that these eight elements be coherently and simultaneously developed. This is one of the major difficulties in the development of universities in backward countries.

For a new department to find simultaneously 12 competent faculty members that can set up a university science program is a fantastically difficult job. This faculty has also to design and supervise the construction of an adequate building, secure funds for shops and lab equipment, and gather a library collection. The training of technicians to staff shops is no less of a time-consuming job. Meanwhile courses have to be taught, better high school graduates attracted, graduate students supported and recruited, research programs initiated. All of this has to be accomplished in a time interval of less than 10 years. Meanwhile science in the advanced countries is moving on and the faculty is not moving with it.

To create a new university in the United States or Britain is rather simple—a board is assembled by calling on experienced members of other boards; a faculty is collected by raiding a few campuses, students are already available, an important bookshop is contracted to purchase a library collection. A university is constructed from already available building blocks by a community that possesses numerous working models.

In a backward community a university has to be constructed from building blocks to be quarried for the purpose by a community that does not possess a working model. The task is exceedingly difficult and challenging. The chances for real success are very small, but the stakes are so high that every effort must be made to develop the proper techniques so as to make the establishment of genuine universities feasible under these difficult conditions.

With these factors in mind one can consider three types of institutions to be developed:

(a) international institutions,

(b) national institutions,

(c) private institutions operated in an international fashion.

A model for an international institution for the Middle East is the International Center for Theoretical Physics in Trieste.[5] It began operations in 1964 under the aegis of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It had a strong scientific leadership and was warmly received by the international scientific community. Its 1964 budget was merely $400,000 a year. To all appearances the center was an instant success. To reach its full potential as a service center for developing countries will require a few more years. We at the American University of Beirut look forward to the establishment of joint programs and appointments with Trieste. There is no doubt in my mind that, given the opportunities, the center should have a very strong influence on physics in the Mediterranean basin.

Trieste-type institutions governed, operated, and staffed on a high level can provide the inspiration, the example, and some brainpower, and can be a channel to locate new competent university officials in the communities in which they are instituted. It is a very simple affair for a high quality theoretical physicist to locate a microbiologist or to round up half a dozen wise men who could serve on a board of trustees of a new college. Hence Trieste-type institutions can play a wider role in the community than solely furthering a particular area of science.

Nearly 150 million people live around the Mediterranean. The institutions of higher learning in this area need considerable revamping. At least two more such centers are needed in two other areas of science to provide a sufficiently broad base for the development of the national educational programs.

NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Naturally the bulk of the education and intellectual activity of the community must be carried within the nationally supported institutions. In the Middle East the secular university is, with minor exceptions, less than 50 years old. These institutions have been asked to do impossible tasks with limited resources and faculty and within a generally inhospitable intellectual climate. In addition to these constraints, these institutions are attempting to transfer essentially foreign cultural elements frequently in the medium of a foreign language. The linguistic preparation of students is generally poor, and library facilities are nearly nonexistent. The political and social upheavals in most developing countries have hit the universities adversely; student enrollments have increased almost tenfold in a decade, faculty salaries have remained constant despite spiraling inflation, academic freedom is severely restricted, no significant increases in faculty and laboratory facilities have paralleled the phenomenal increase in student enrollment. No wonder, then, that higher education in most of these countries is in a state of severe paralysis.

There is a constant numerical growth in the number and size of existing universities, but unfortunately this is merely a vegetative growth. In the opinion of many faculty members throughout the area, standards are now below those of a decade ago.

The new universities are founded with inadequate faculty and facilities and flooded with students. The first problem is to find competent deans and departmental chairmen. In view of the fact that there are no serious graduate schools in the

[5] Abdus Salam, "A New Center for Physics," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, XXI (1965), pp. 43–45.

area, most faculty members deteriorate over the years. As a result it is exceedingly difficult to recruit the needed key academic-administrative personnel from the campuses of the older universities to staff the new institutions.

The problem of this shortage of highly competent scientists who can assume key positions is not being faced and will definitely grow with time. I estimate that there are some 25 institutions enrolling more than 150,000 college students in dire need of such faculty within the Arab Middle East alone. (Arab Middle Eastern universities and colleges enrolled more than 250,000 students in 1966–67.)

This being the situation, what are the remedies? There are certain decisions that could transform some institutions almost immediately: e.g. raising the salary scale of the professors at the Lebanese University to $7,000 per 9 months (a raise of 300 percent!) would enable the university to employ a full-time faculty. (The present scale is so low that faculty members have to work in several schools to subsist—a good office secretary in Beirut now earns more than a professor at the Lebanese University.) A more experienced leadership (president, deans, chairmen) in the new Gulf Universities would make it possible to create great centers of learning and technology. Briefly, the road to salvation for the new universities is through eminently qualified directors and chairmen of departments, international boards of managers, independence from local government, and an adequate budget.

This is more easily said than done. The power to raise salaries and appoint at least the first set of university administrators is in the hands of government administrators and politicians. These are people who, almost without exception, are technically and scientifically illiterate. Some may have studied for a B.S. in physics in their younger days. Some even seek the advice of the local notable scientists. In most of the backward countries of concern to us here, the scientists are of the Ph.D. vintage of 1950 or thereabouts. These have developed a strong following in the press, which resulted originally from an attempt to create social consciousness vis-à-vis the sciences. But they invariably have reached a regrettably high degree of deterioration. In general they are the only scientists known to the politicians.

### PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

The third category of institution I will consider is the private one endowed with an international character. There are a few of this kind in the Arab Middle East. The most famous is the American University in Beirut. Others are the University of St. Joseph (Beirut), the American University in Cairo, and al-Hikmah (Baghdad). All of these institutions were founded as a result of 19th-century American and European missionary programs in the East.

During the past 15 years the American University of Beirut has been developing its plant, faculty, and academic program. The American University in Cairo also began such a development a few years ago. These institutions enjoy a vast number of advantages over their sister Middle Eastern institutions. They are private institutions—hence more flexible and capable of more independent and rapid change than the national universities. They are better financed and better equipped. Their student-teacher ratio is about 9 to 1. They have a mixed international faculty and can develop rapidly a high standard for faculty appointment.

Though ideally situated to be links between the national institutions and the American and Eu-

ropean centers of learning, these two universities have some disadvantages. They enroll only 1 percent of the Arab college student population; because of their missionary ancestry half of their students are from Middle Eastern minority groups; and the academic programs are nearly all on the undergraduate level, with the exception of the American University of Beirut Medical School and the new Ph.D. programs (in 1965–66 these last enrolled only 8 students). Because of these disadvantages these private institutions have not contributed significantly to the development of higher education in the region.

These institutions can undergo the requisite transformation into graduate study and research universities much more speedily and readily than any other institutions in the area. They can then serve in the dual function of graduating young scientists and scholars to staff the sister colleges and as a training center for competent academic administrators, chairmen of departments, and deans.

The American University of Beirut is the most highly developed of this class of institution; yet it will require a strong and an imaginative leadership to transform it into a graduate school university. No less than a decade of hard work and substantial additional financial support will be required for such a transformation.

I do not conceive of the national and private institutions as operating independently of each other. They must exchange students and faculty, share facilities, and evolve a more studied and experimental attitude toward the common tasks facing them. The growth of each element in this network of institutions should strengthen them all and enhance their abilities to meet the exciting challenge facing a community which has the choice of being doomed to perpetual backwardness or of being saved to usher in a new metamorphosis of an ancient civilization.

### APPLIED RESEARCH

Isolated universities and advanced research institutes are incapable of converting new scientific discoveries into useful technological products. Scientific discoveries occur in applied research centers. These centers then transfer responsibilities to special pilot plants or research stations and thence to large-scale production. Until recently this chain of events was slow and subject to change. Ritchie Calder[6] states that until 1900 the average interval between conception and first working model was 176 years. This interval was shortened to about 25 years in the period 1910 to 1940. This contraction continues as the development of the efficiency and extent of the invention machine proceeds. Today invention and discovery are highly organized affairs. Backward countries need to establish a spectrum of institutes to link the most advanced speculations to the most applied activities.

In order that these units be effective elements in the rapid transformation of the appropriate segments of the economy, they should be staffed by persons with a good mastery of theoretical subjects and they must include some good pure research in their activities. As an example, an agricultural research station should have research programs in genetics and biochemistry. In this fashion every unit will be functionally linked to the other institutes in the hierarchy.

It must be remembered that no society will support a program—even at a modest cost of 1 percent of its GNP—unless this program provides tangible material benefits.

[6] "The Speed of Change," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* XXI (1965), p. 2.

The rapid growth of science since 1760 is due directly to the rapid evolution of this network that translates the theoretical or pure research into practical benefits of immediate value. Whenever people still argue the virtues of applied versus pure research, there is no pure or applied science.

IN CONCLUSION, it appears that the prosperity, welfare, and stability of developing countries are intimately dependent on their being able to create their own universities. The current struggle for economic and political survival of the South American and Afro-Asian states is now threatened both from within and from without. Needless to say, the well-being of the entire human community—including that of the advanced nations—is jeopardized if the present wave of political disintegration continues unhampered.

---

## Time To Ask Questions

It is plain that educational exchange has attained an established place in U.S. higher education. It is no longer a pioneering adventure, undertaken for the vague, if benevolent, reason that it contributes to international good will. Hopefully it does, but it has also become an instrument of economic and social progress, a tool in manpower training, a means of educational development. For these reasons, it has earned the commitment of governments, foundations, colleges and universities, private organizations of every kind, and the public in general. This commitment is cause for gratification, but it also will be cause for concern if educational exchange, by its very acceptance, is made immune from critical review and reappraisal.

In the concern to maintain established programs and to originate new ones, there seems no commensurate concern to evaluate what we have been doing, to determine whether our objectives are being realized, to appraise our experience, and to apply the lessons of that experience to changing needs and conditions. For example, does not the passage of twenty years since the establishment of the Fulbright Program require all of us to examine whether the objectives and operation of that most distinguished program are still valid? Do we know enough about the effect of undergraduate study abroad for American students to justify the rapid expansion of "Junior Year Programs" by American institutions? Have we analyzed the academic achievement of foreign students in such a way as to permit us to predict academic success and draw up meaningful standards for admission? Do we know what kinds of exchange programs are most effective in meeting the needs of countries whose educational progress we seek to assist? Do we know to what extent foreign students are a significant factor in the "brain drain"? Have we explored the impact of foreign professors on campus so that the exchange of scholars can be made more productive? With 140,000 persons now involved in educational exchange between the United States and the rest of the world, it is time for all who are engaged in international education—on campuses, in government, and in private organizations—to ask such questions and to make a more determined search for the answers.

—Kenneth Holland, president of the Institute of International Education, in foreword to *Open Doors 1967*.

*If present trends in international programs in American colleges and universities continue, "the new breed of university directors of international programs will continue to increase and to play increasingly important roles on an increasing number of campuses." Dr. Hajda describes the varied roles of these international officers as members of university communities.*

# The International Officer and the University

*by JOSEPH HAJDA*

I WELCOME the opportunity to expose my modest insights to the scrutiny of professional colleagues. This paper attempts to develop analytical concepts to stimulate our thinking about the roles of international officers as members of university communities.[1] It outlines certain relevant categories I have observed as Director of International Activities at Kansas State University. It does not appraise their significance for other institutions of higher learning but assumes that their implications might have quite general application.

## THE NEW BREED

The growing involvement of the United States in world affairs is increasingly involving our universities. Their response to new demands of the U.S. world role is making them better institutions of higher learning. They have added new faculty positions and widened curricula in international studies. They have reformed organizational structures to promote efficiency in the management of international programs. And they have created a new breed of university officers, endowed them with new titles, offices, and staff, and have assigned to them new functions in the international sphere.

[1] Adapted from a position paper presented at a regional conference on "The International Officer and the University," at Estes Park, Colo., July 21, 1967.

JOSEPH HAJDA, *director of international activities at Kansas State University, was born in Czechoslovakia. He received his Ph.D. in international relations from Indiana University in 1955 and has taught political science at Indiana and Kansas State. Dr. Hajda served on the staff of Christian A. Herter, Special Representative of the President for Trade Negotiations, in 1964–65 while on a leave of absence from Kansas State.*

Most internationally oriented universities in the United States have developed an organizational device for tying international programs into the mainstream of the university community. They have been relatively successful in setting up organizational structures to carry out policies of the institutions. Some universities have deans or directors of international programs with offices attached to the president or chancellor. Some directors of international programs have both staff and line functions with directors handling nonacademic international matters and maintaining direct contact with vice-presidents, deans, and departmental chairmen.

A case study of one university may throw some light on the question of the place of the new breed in university affairs.

### A CASE STUDY: KANSAS STATE

Kansas State University has been rapidly expanding its international complexion and international interests. It has been engaged in formal and informal international affiliations, exchanges, and contracts, and it has considerably strengthened its capacity for transnational activities that involve sending or receiving persons or things between it and cooperating foreign institutions. It has many faculty and students abroad, has stepped up training of Americans for work abroad, has served as host to an increasing number of visiting foreign scholars, and is providing education and training for several hundred students and professionals from other lands. It also is promoting exchanges of educational materials and professional collaboration of transnational nature. The university has emphasized curricular developments in area and language courses and courses concerned with international or foreign affairs, international relations, intercultural studies, and comparative studies, as well as research focusing on transnational topics, functions, and processes.

After improvising to handle activities in the international sphere, Kansas State developed in the early 1960's administrative arrangements to promote the orderly growth of internationally oriented programs. These arrangements have strong roots at faculty and departmental levels and have complete backing of top administrators.

The aim of the administrative reform, approved in 1963, was to preserve the decentralized system of administration, which permits flexibility of operation, and to provide for overall liaison through the director of international activities among members of the university community interested in international education and responsible for particular international programs. It furnished the academic framework of the university with an important springboard to improve and expand international programs: The Council on International Activities, which is chaired by the director of international activities. The council considers and recommends orderly and efficient growth in the international dimension.

The office of the director was established in 1963 to serve as a central focal point from which international programs could be reviewed, coordinated, improved, and expanded. The long-term goals of the office are to broaden the academic and social horizons of students and faculty, to enrich intellectual opportunities for the entire university community, to coordinate and serve as a nerve center for all university international activities, and to insure effective use of resources available to the university for international activities.

### RELATIONSHIPS

It would be interesting to look upon the roles of the director in influence, power, and prestige. How-

ever, it might be more profitable to look at the question as a problem of steering, essentially from the viewpoint of relationships and communications.

The relationships and communications with which the director must concern himself are campus-wide, nationwide, and worldwide. The director deals with:

1. *The president*, who has the top decision-making authority in the development of the university's international dimension and administrative arrangements. The president is the chief international officer of the university and its chief representative in national and international deliberations over future directions of international education. The director reports directly to the president and serves as his special assistant for international educational affairs. The director provides several essential supporting functions. He keeps the president informed of program plans, problems, and accomplishments, and offers advice and recommendations on questions of university policy in the international sphere. He also accepts some administrative assignments from the president's office. He is asked to analyze and to refine a multiplicity of international problems for the president. He represents the president and his policies to the campus community and off-campus public, and he represents the problems of the campus community and off-campus public to the president.

2. *Vice-presidents, deans, and department heads* who have special responsibilities for planning, budgeting, developing, and administering particular international programs. The director consults with them and keeps them informed about international activities of the university. Given the decision-making process of the university, the importance of these relationships and communications is self-evident. The first echelon of administrators does not decide on all program roles. The second and third echelons at times play crucial roles in determining what programs are to be assumed and carried out as well as how, when, and under what circumstances.

3. *The Council on International Activities*, which includes representatives of each college and key persons with international program responsibilities. The director, as chairman, must provide council leadership to strengthen academic programs of the university, record and disseminate information, and coordinate international programs. The director implements decisions of the council. While the council only recommends new policies and programs through the director to the president, it sponsors such international activities as the annual International Week, with prominent outside speakers, exhibits, receptions, and other activities, and monthly international luncheons with speakers selected from the university community. The council is an important force in strengthening international educational activities of the entire university community, and the director's relationship and communication with the council affects the extent to which the council actively supports, encourages, and develops international programs.

4. *Individual full-time international officers and part-time coordinators of international programs*, who play important roles in improving the capability of the university to deal with its international dimension. The director works with them to determine whether proposed activities and programs are feasible, reviews with them problems and accomplishments, and with them provides a feedback to the academic mainstream. The director must maintain close contacts with the director of international

agricultural programs, the foreign student adviser, Fulbright adviser, the coordinator of an international project in the college of engineering, chairman of the committee on South Asia studies, administrator of summer study-abroad programs, chairman of the interdepartmental linguistic committee (who directs English for international students), director of admissions, dean of the graduate school, business manager, coordinator of 4–H international programs (with special emphasis on international farm youth exchange), coordinator of community services, and other members of the university community with special responsibilities for international activities and programs.

5. *Action-oriented members of the university community* who seek to improve and expand international activities of the university. The director reviews with them new ideas and proposals and advises steps toward attaining their aims. The proposals concern emphasis on particular geographic areas of the world or on particular problems, improvement of faculty competencies, strengthening library resources, adding world affairs content to undergraduate and graduate curricula, and initiation of projects in different geographic areas of the world. Such reviews and consultations with action-oriented individuals may provide bases for further discussions by the council on international activities and implementing action. In short, the director's office serves as a brokerage center of ideas and aspirations.

6. *Students and faculty,* and even off-campus persons, who are interested in work, study, and travel opportunities abroad. The director furnishes reference materials and information on profiles of higher educational facilities in foreign countries and geographic areas where Americans can study, as well as information on summer courses, travel, employment, teaching opportunities, advisory services, and related questions.

7. *Students and scholars from other lands,* who study, teach, and do research at the university, and with special visitors from other lands such as ambassadors, other diplomatic personnel, and government officials. The director helps bring distinguished foreign scholars as visiting professors, assists in attracting capable students from all parts of the world to various departments of the university, arranges for contacts and discussions with foreign visitors to the campus, and participates in improving both cultural and informational programs. He plays a special role as a nerve center for relaying messages to the university community and to the mass media during international crises. Important tasks may include checking to see how citizens of the countries at war with each other are being treated, squelching false rumors about university policy, and performing other duties calling for tact and diplomacy. Most of these jobs must be done quietly, behind the scenes, and with utmost care.

8. *Other United States universities,* particularly those with similar programs, aspirations, and affiliations. The director joins with representatives of other universities to review and appraise international programs and to propose joint ventures. He exchanges information about international programs with other universities.

9. *Universities in other lands*—those maintaining special ties with the director's university and those seeking to establish new relationships. The director is responsible for the development and administration of affiliation and exchange programs involving regular annual interchange of students and occasional faculty exchange, and maintains close liaison with the affiliated universities. He meets with represen-

tatives of foreign universities and travels abroad to visit officers of universities to discuss and review international educational programs and new proposals for university-to-university cooperation. He also serves as a correspondent with the International Association of Universities.

10. *Agencies of the U.S. Government* such as the Department of State, Agency for International Development, Department of Agriculture, Peace Corps, National Science Foundation, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; with the Governor's staff and the Members of Congress; and with private foundations and other internationally oriented organizations —particularly the Institute of International Education.

11. The director also maintains a close relationship with *the academic department and the academic profession* to which he belongs. He participates in the supervision of the work of graduate students, does a certain amount of classroom teaching, and strives for occasional publication of his research efforts.

### CAMPUS CONSTRAINTS

Each of these categories of relationships and communications is important in shaping directions of international programs, in improving planning for broad educational strategies, and particularly in providing insights into the perennial problem of redefining and refining goals and objectives. The director is faced with a wide spectrum of outlooks and behavior giving rise to various policy constraints that shape his role in the university community. These constraints are varying in strength, and depend in part on his intention to maintain or achieve desired effects on his associates, a particular segment of the institution, the whole university community, other institutions of higher learning, nonacademic organizations and agencies of government, or foreign universities and countries.

The director must revise his "ideal" approach—his preferred role —to terms that include prudent assessments of constraints. He may be tempted to propose plans and programs that ignore the constraints. If he succumbs to such temptation too often, he is likely to be more frustrated than successful.

He may, of course, wish to take the initiative and plant seeds that may germinate elsewhere and produce flowers that do not have the shapes and colors originally desired. But that is less frustrating than seeds carefully planted — never sprouting.

To be effective, the director has to keep two-way lines of communication open on his own campus and elsewhere to be able to collect data about significant developments affecting the mood for change, to keep abreast of ideas in the various communication channels around him, and to reinforce those actively supporting international programs, to win over the doubtful, and to activate those unmindful of international programs.

The director participates in the bargaining process, usually called "campus politics." To succeed, he must estimate fairly accurately the probabilities that his ideas will be accepted by the campus establishment. He must be prepared to make concessions when reactions to his proposals are not favorable. If he is striving for a major change or innovation, he must assume that change inevitably involves jolts, difficulties, and opposition, and requires adjustment time. When a particular segment of the institution is concerned mainly with its security rather than with change, and when it is strongly attached to an outmoded view of international educational affairs, the director finds his job at least challenging—

if not fenced in by emotional but real barriers.

Steps toward perfecting a university's international dimension are seldom great leaps forward even in an institution that has shifted emphasis from security to change and is already impressively involved in international educational programs.

The role of the director, of course, also depends on the personal qualities of the man occupying the office, his conception of the office, and his international perspectives.

## NEW FRONTIERS

If present trends in international programs in American colleges and universities continue, we should expect quantitative and qualitative growth both of institutions involved and of their international programs. We should also expect an institutionalization of programs, within and among institutions involved, as well as more cooperation between universities and nonacademic entities such as the Institute of International Education, certain government agencies, and some private organizations. International studies should continue to expand, and more transnational research activities can be expected, many of them overseas, with special emphasis on developmental problems. Study and travel abroad programs, as well as voluntary service abroad, likely will expand. More foreign students and professionals can be expected to come to the United States. Educational activities in developing countries will probably involve more experienced American faculty than before.

Unless all these trends suddenly reverse, the new breed of university directors of international programs will continue to increase and to play increasingly important roles on an increasing number of campuses. The second generation of directors of international programs should be able to capitalize on previous experience and to accelerate needed innovations. Three basic tasks our universities now face seem to me to be:

1. Increasing emphasis on interinstitutional relations, both in the United States and abroad. The transnational relationships are difficult and very few universities have developed meaningful university-to-university "partnerships" characterized by a multiplicity of enduring relationships.

2. Improving the "context of communications," by encouraging dialog among academic peers. This is the task of developing and keeping open adequate permanent channels of communication within the university community and between its members and members of other institutions of higher learning, international institutes and organizations, and governmental agencies. Improving the transnational context of communication is a most urgent task that remains a neglected aspect of international affairs despite lofty pronouncements of our national leaders.

3. Promoting international educational development by strengthening traditional disciplines and forming new disciplines. This task envisions a university strategy of investment and development that considers all critical elements and strives for orderly and efficient growth and optimum results from the resources at hand.

DESPITE MANY PERPLEXING PROBLEMS in world affairs, such international educational programs remain among the soundest approaches for advancing the frontiers of our universities, world societies, and the human race.

# Lausanne Conference on the Brain Drain

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE on the brain drain was held recently in Lausanne, Switzerland, under the joint sponsorship of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Centre de Recherches Européennes. On August 25 and 26, university professors and technical experts from 10 countries and 5 continents met to discuss the reports and proposals which they had prepared and circulated among themselves in advance of the conference.[1] Cochairmen of the conference were Professor Henri Rieben of the University of Lausanne and director of the Centre de Recherches Européennes, and Professor Walter Adams of Michigan State University and a member of the Advisory Commission.

The "brain drain"—the international migration of scientists, doctors, engineers, and savants—is the catch phrase used to describe the movement of top-level manpower from the underdeveloped countries to Western Europe, and from both these areas to the United States. Statistics to measure the dimensions of the problem are at best only fragmentary, but they have stimulated considerable discussion and debate not only by academicians and specialists, but by journalists, politicians, and international organizations. The big question is what to do about the problem, and how to find a solution that stops short of such drastic measures as an embargo on the "export" and an absolute exclusion of the "import" of brains. This was the task of the conference which concentrated on some of the following questions:

(1) *Salary differentials,* both between countries and within the sending and receiving countries. To what extent is the flow of British doctors to the United States explained by the free market price for doctors abroad combined with a wage freeze at home?

(2) *Professional opportunity.* To what extent is the vertical mobility in academic life and industry an important determinant of emigration patterns? Is a scientist even more concerned with logistical support for his activities, in the form of equipment and laboratories, and the availability of colleagues working in the same field, than he is with salary? In the underdeveloped countries, is the emigration of top-level manpower simply an index of limited absorptive capacity by an economy at an early stage of development?

(3) *Lack of receptivity to change in the home country.* To what extent does highly trained manpower emigrate in search of opportunities for innovation, experimentation, and change? To what extent is such manpower pushed out of its native environment because the latter is encrusted with the dead weight of traditionalism, conservatism, and bureaucracy? Do students trained abroad find that their newly acquired talents are suspect in the eyes of the native power structure, and that they therefore cannot be applied to the realization of the individual's career aspirations and the country's economic develop-

[1] The papers presented are to be published by the Macmillan Company in January 1968 in a volume entitled "The Brain Drain."

ment? Is the rigid hierarchical structure in the home country's educational system, for example, heavily weighted against the young and the newcomer—that is, is it a cartel with restrictive entry policies?

(4) *Relevance of foreign training.* Is the training received, especially by students from underdeveloped countries, simple irrelevant in societies struggling with the problems of scarcity rather than affluence—societies beset by preindustrial, agricultural development problems characteristic of early growth stages? Is there a disproportionately heavy emphasis on advanced and sophisticated training abroad rather than on "second-level" training at home?

(5) *Lack of realistic manpower policies.* Is there an overinvestment in the production of top-level manpower without regard to the absorptive capacity of developing countries? Do certain countries, like the Philippines for example, produce too many medical doctors in relation to effective (i.e. economic) demand for such talent at home? Do some of the African or Asian countries produce a disproportionate number of scientists in relation to the number they can possibly use at the current stage of their development? Is there a serious lack of proportion in the "mix" between human and physical capital in the development plans of underdeveloped countries?

(6) *Technology gap.* Is there a serious gap between the rate of technological progress, especially in science-based industries, between countries like the United States and the advanced industrial nations of Western Europe? Is the existence of such a gap a primary cause for emigration? To what extent can the gap be closed by a heavier investment by Western Europe in research and development in the governmental, industrial, and educational sectors?

(7) *Political balkanization.* To what extent is the absence of political integration a force for limiting the size of the market, thus obviating the possibilities of specialization? That is, to what extent is a disunited Europe, for example, a cause of unrealized economies of scale, which in turn explain the existence of a technology gap, which in turn is a factor making for emigration of leading scientists? To what extent is the drive for independent nationhood on a developing continent like Africa a force retarding the growth of markets and the development of an economy which in the foreseeable future can compete on roughly equal terms with the more advanced industrial nations?

(8) *Discrimination on noneconomic grounds.* What is the impact of discrimination because of nationality, caste, tribe, political affiliation, family, etc.? Especially in the case of underdeveloped countries, can they afford the luxury of discrimination against individuals on grounds other than their potential contribution to economic development? Is the lack of a strict meritocracy an important factor stimulating the emigration of an ever more mobile manpower elite?

(9) *Monopolistic restrictions in advanced countries.* Are the cartel-like guild restrictions of such organizations as the American Medical Association an important factor contributing to a dynamic and persistent shortage of doctors in the United States? Does the existence of such a shortage, given prevailing salary differentials between countries, set up an irresistible pull factor making for the brain drain? Is it not incumbent on the United States and the highly developed countries of Western Europe to eliminate such restrictions, if indeed they are anxious to assist the underdeveloped nations by helping them conserve badly needed manpower for their own development programs?

## Contributors to the Conference

Professor Walter Adams
Economics Department
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Mich.

Professor Kenneth Boulding
Economics Department
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colo.

Professor George Coutsoumaris
Graduate School of Economics
and Business Sciences
Athens, Greece

Professor V. M. Dandekar, Director
Gokhale Institute of Politics
and Economics
Poona, India

Professor Stevan Dedijer
Research Policy Program
University of Lund
Lund, Sweden

Professor Joel B. Dirlam
Economics Department
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, R.I.

Dr. R. K. A. Gardiner
Executive Secretary
U.N. Economic Commission for
Africa
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Professor Jacques Houssiaux
University of Nancy
Nancy, France

Professor Charles Iffland
University of Lausanne
Lausanne, Switzerland

Professor Harry G. Johnson
London School of Economics
London, England

Dr. Charles V. Kidd
Executive Secretary
Federal Council for Science
and Technology
Washington, D.C.

Professor Charles P. Kindleberger
Massachusetts Institute
of Technology
Cambridge, Mass.

Professor Robert Mossé
University of Grenoble
Grenoble, France

Professor Hla Myint
London School of Economics
London, England

Dr. Ing. Enrique Oteiza, Director
Instituto Torcuato di Tella
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Professor Don Patinkin
Economics Department
Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Professor Henri Rieben, Director
Centre de Recherches Européennes
Lausanne, Switzerland

Professor Brinley Thomas
Economics Department
University College of South Wales
Cardiff, Wales, United Kingdom

*Following is the text of the communique issued at Lausanne on August 26, 1967.*

## Final Communique

IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, the brain drain is an index of the structural maladjustments in both the "sending" and "receiving" countries.

### THE THIRD WORLD

With respect to the underdeveloped nations, the brain drain is both cause and effect of all the economic, social, and political factors which we lump under the term "underdevelopment." It points up the sad fact that economic development is not just a matter of producing needed skills, but of producing the opportunities to use these skills. It explains the strange paradox that needed manpower will emigrate from a country even though that country has crying need for human capital. Like it or not, the basic problem is the lack of absorptive capacity, in the sense of effective economic demand, which characterizes most underdeveloped countries.

We must recognize, therefore, that absorptive capacity is a function of the developmental stage in which a nation happens to find itself. Creating additional human capital, or substituting it for physical capital, *per se*, is not a simple and quick road to development. It is quixotic to suppose that the developmental process can be telescoped by resorting to such facile techniques. Development is an integrated process both of accumulating capital in the broad sense—material, human, and intellectual—and of evolving a culture that promotes the efficient use of such capital and of constantly seeking to improve the efficiency of use. It is not likely to be promoted by concentrating attention and economic policy on the accumulation of one type of capital (larger numbers of educated people) on the assumption that all else will follow. It will not.

The advanced countries, therefore, who wish to provide effective aid to the underdeveloped world, should not be diverted by a concern with the brain drain which only postpones the start of meaningful action. Instead, they should increase the flow of development assistance beyond the trickle which it now is. They should enhance the efficiency with which such assistance is used by its recipients to promote development. And they should expand the opportunities of the less developed countries to participate in world economic growth through international trade. These concrete rational proposals should command general support.

### WESTERN EUROPE

As for the countries of Western Europe concerned about the outflow of talent, their task is far simpler. Indeed, they might regard the brain drain as an objective indicator —a welcome exogenous force—identifying the agenda for action. For them the brain drain can serve as a force for modernization—a stimulant to the elimination of the remaining vestiges of a tradition-oriented, class-ridden, status-conscious society. It can help Western Europe institute the changes which will make it competitively more viable in a shrinking universe. In the process, the drain will help remove the very causes which brought it into being.

For the countries of Western Europe, the message of the "brain drain" might well be: "the fault lies not only in your stars, but also in you."

### SOME SUGGESTED POLICIES

A specific agenda for action should include consideration of the

following policies: (1) Raise salaries, especially in countries of Western Europe which can afford to do so for scarce talents and skills. (2) Revise internal salary structures, including in the underdeveloped countries, to avoid the loss of professionals (like Philippine doctors who not only emigrate, but who become Manila businessmen rather than practice medicine). (3) Increase professional opportunity at home—especially for the young scientist, engineer, and medical doctor. (4) Increase the receptivity to change—a willingness to experiment, innovate, and share power with a newly emerging elite. (5) Restructure the nation's investment in education to produce the kinds of skills required and the right quantity of each. Reduce the amount of foreign training, especially for nationals from underdeveloped countries. Don't "overeducate" students without regard to the nation's developmental needs. Don't send too many young students abroad, especially at the predoctoral level. Rationalize manpower policies so that the human capital produced will actually be used. (6) Promote economic and political integration, not only in Western Europe but also in Africa and elsewhere. One country, by itself, may lack the resources to retain high-level talent, but multinational, regional groupings of states and people could offer far greater opportunities. For competitive survival in the modern world, the 19th century nation-state, confined to narrow boundaries, is probably no longer viable. A united Europe, for example, is necessary not only for effective competition with the U.S. but also to help solve the problems of underdevelopment in poorer countries. (7) Eliminate discrimination and bigotry because of caste, tribe, religion, national origin, political beliefs, etc. No nation, however advanced, can deny itself the use of talent for such noneconomic reasons. (8) Remove monopolistic restrictions like those of the American Medical Association—in the "pull" countries which serve as an artificial magnet for foreign manpower.

IN A POSITIVE SENSE, the brain drain can be a primary catalyst to stimulate a nation to initiate change and self-regeneration—an incentive to modernize and adapt to the exigencies of powerful international market forces.



☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1967 O - 305-213 (65)